THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

PARADIGMATIC CHANGE IN VOLUNTARY SPORT ORGANIZATIONS

BY

DALE CUNNINGHAM

©

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT STUDIES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL 1986

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-32440-6

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Dale Cunningham
TITLE OF THESIS: Paradigmatic Change in Voluntary Sport Organizations
DEGREE: Master of Arts
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: Fall 1986

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

DA Cunningham
(Student's signature)

11029 - 107 ST
(Student's permanent address)
EDMONTON ALTA

Date: OCT 14, 1986

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled Paradigmatic Change in Voluntary Sport Organizations submitted by Dale Cunningham in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Physical Education.

....
Supervisor

....

Greenwood
....

Glassford
....

Date: Oct 14, 1986

Dedication

To my friend Frank

Who borrows the Medusa's eye
Resigns to the empirical lie.
The knower petrifies the known:
The subtle dancer turns to stone.

T. Roszak

Abstract

PSOs operate with particular structural arrangements which are given meaning and coherence by underlying interpretive schemes - sets of beliefs and values. Particular interpretive schemes coupled with associated structural arrangements constitute an organizational paradigm. Two paradigms were proposed for PSOs; paradigm A, the Kitchen Table Volunteer and paradigm B, the Corporate Professional. Specific sets of organizational values and structures were suggested as being associated with each paradigm. An intermediate category - referred to as Schizoid - representing sets of values fitting neither paradigm A or B and indicative of transition between these paradigms was also proposed. The interaction between the values of organizational members and the structures through which they are expressed was found to be mediated by contextual factors. These contextual factors included those internal to the organization such as significant organizational members and those external to the organization such as other organizations which have significant influence upon the PSO.

Generally the organizations in the study were found to exhibit interpretive schemes which supported a paradigm B orientation, this was true of all time periods. During the early time periods this orientation was not accompanied by structural arrangements reflecting a similar paradigm B orientation. The structural dimensions in time period one reflected a Schizoid structural orientation. These results suggest an initial incongruence between organizational values and structures which may be described as paradigm incoherence (Schizoid paradigm orientation).

In later time periods the results indicated structural dimensions shifting towards a paradigm B orientation. This fact coupled with organizational interpretive schemes which continued to exhibit a paradigm

B orientation indicated increasing paradigm coherence - values and structures supporting a paradigm B orientation.

PSO interpretive schemes were conceived as containing specific sets of beliefs and values. These values and beliefs were measured by examining the responses to statements of value preference based on issues of contemporary concern to the Alberta amateur sport community. These responses were scored according to a simple five point Likert scale. The scores determined placement on a scale which included three categories - Paradigm A orientation; Schizoid orientation; or a Paradigm B orientation.

PSO organizational structures were conceived of as consisting of three primary dimensions - Specialization, Standardization, and Centralization/decentralization. These dimensions were measured for each of a range of organizational systems which were thought to comprise the structured activities of the PSOs. A structured interview/questionnaire was administered to key informants (top administrators) and levels of all three dimensions were determined for each system utilizing a simple three point rating (1 - low, 2 - medium, 3 - high). These scores, when totalled for each organization over all five timeslices determined placement on a simple scale which again included three categories - Paradigm A, Schizoid orientation, and Paradigm B.

Contextual factors were also examined. Those that seemed to have most impact on the PSOs were significant or charismatic leaders, and influential external organizations such as government and parent national sport organizations. The impact of these factors was examined in a descriptive manner by asking general questions about the areas of Resources, Technology, and Environment. The responses to these questions were not dealt with in a systematic manner, but were evaluated on the basis of which factor was brought up consistently during the interviews.

Acknowledgements

The writing of this thesis (which in a wider sense I more commonly refer to as my "project") has taken place in a span of time during which many other "things" have been happening. I am of the belief that all of these "things", the "project" included are somehow interrelated.......they affect one another. Collectively these "things" (call it growing up, call it getting on, call it life, call it whatever!) happen or come about through the actions of people, oneself and others. Although modest in number, to properly acknowledge those individuals who have been of positive - and equally important - of negative influence during this time would take more space than I am prepared to give here. Therefore I will limit my acknowledgements to those people who have been, in different ways, closest to the "project" itself.

I would first and foremost like to acknowledge my parents and my brothers and sister. For my folks the "thesis" holds very little meaning, but they understand very well what the "project" was all about. Within this group I would like to include my "surrogate parents" Ron and Liz (or should I say Liz and Ron), their place was always home and thats important.

I would like to extend thanks to each member of my committee. I have only been involved with one committee in my academic experience, but I suspect that this particular one would rate among the best, as far as committees go. Each member deserves individual mention which I will provide, but before doing so I must add that a committee is a group of individuals, each which bring their personal values and style to the process. This at times adds a certain uhh.... dynamic tension to the process. I believe however that such tension contributes to an end product which is the richer for it. So.... having said as much I extend the following personal thankyous.

To my advisor Trevor, whose working energy levels exceed those of anyone I know, thankyou. Your efforts to impart some of this energy my way often exasperated me, but in the end helped put me over the top.

To Royston, who is as game a chess player as any I know. Thanks for your ability to spontaneously provide three viable ideas in response to any one question I would ask, and for always having a willing ear.

To Dr. Gerry Glassford, thankyou for your assistance at a crucial time early in this "project" which enabled it to continue and unfold.

To Bob, thanks. Your ability to listen and to put issues into perspective smoothed many rough spots for me. But more important was your willingness to treat this particular neophyte as both friend and colleague.

And finally I would like to acknowledge a few "special" people, some who are no longer part of this "project" and some who are but who may not have ever been aware of the fact! To these people I must say thankyou even though some may not know or care why.

Table of Contents

Chapter Page

I. Introduction and Statement of the Problem....................1
  I. Introduction....................1
  II. Statement of Research Problem....................7
  III. Justification for Study....................8
  IV. Limitations and Delimitations....................9
  V. Definition of Key Terms....................11

II. Review of Literature and Theoretical Overview....................14
  I. Review of Literature....................14
    Introduction....................14
    The Sport Literature....................15
    The Organization Literature....................21
  II. Theoretical Overview....................25
    Organizational Paradigms....................26
    Interpretive Schemes....................31
    Momentum....................33
    Tracks....................38
    Interpretive Decoupling....................38
    Structural Detachment....................41

III. Methodology....................45
  I. Introduction....................45
  II. Research Methods....................45
  III. Sample Selection....................47
  IV. The Development of Data Gathering Instruments....................48

V. Selection of Time Periods for Analysis.......................................52
VI. Data Collection...52
VII. Operationalization of Concepts..53
Organizational Interpretive Schemes...53
A. Conceptualization...53
B. Operational Measures...56
Organizational Structure...59
A. Conceptualization...59
B. Operational Measures...61

IV. Results and Discussion...66
I. Introduction...66
II. PSO Interpretive Schemes - Value Questionnaire Results..67
General Trends...67
Specific Differences..71
III. PSO Structures - Structure Questionnaire Results..74
Similarities Across Organizations...74
Differences Over Time Between Organizations...76
Differences Over Time Among Systems...................................79
Summary...82
A. General Trends...83
B. Similarities Across Organizations...............................83
C. Differences Across Timeslices Between and Within PSOs.......................................83
IV. Contextual Factors - Questionnaire Results...84

Provincial Government.......... 85
Parent National Organizations.......... 88
Significant Organizational Members.......... 90
V. Values and Structures - The Temporal Sequencing of Change.......... 91

V. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.......... 98
I. Summary.......... 98
Conceptual Background.......... 98
Methodology.......... 99
Findings.......... 100
II. Conclusions and Discussion.......... 102
III. Recommendations.......... 105

Bibliography.......... 107

Appendix A. Structure Questionnaire.......... 116

Appendix B. Value Areas.......... 126

Appendix C. Value Questionnaire.......... 128

Appendix D. Decision Events.......... 136

Appendix E. Results.......... 139

List of Tables

Table	Description	Page
1.	Timeslices	138
2.	Value Questionnaire Results	140
3.	Structure Questionnaire Results	141
	A. AVA	
	B. CASA-AS	
	C. CFSA-AS	
	D. AVA	

Chapter I Introduction and Statement of the Problem

I Introduction

The primary agents responsible for the sanction and administration of amateur sport in Canada are those national and provincial associations which regulate and integrate the activities of their particular sport. An example of such an agency at the national level would be the Canadian Volleyball Association (CVA). The provincial equivalent of the CVA would be the Alberta Volleyball Association. These associations, hereafter referred to as national sport organizations (NSOs) and provincial sport organizations (PSOs), are responsible for a number of activities. These activities include the sanction and organization of provincial and national championships, the interpretation of rule changes, fund raising, organizational development, and the technical development of groups such as athletes, coaches, and officials.

The majority of these amateur sport organizations are operated and administered through the efforts of volunteer workers. Spokespersons at both the federal and provincial levels of government have acknowledged the contribution that voluntary organizations make in all areas of our amateur sport delivery system. For example, Iona Campagnolo, President of the Liberal Party of Canada and former Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport stated in the National Policy on Amateur Sport, Partners in the Pursuit of Excellence (1979: 15) that "at every level of every sport there is a host of organizations, most of them voluntary dedicated to encouraging participation, identifying talent, generating training programs and providing opportunities for competition". In addition, at the provincial level the "Guiding Principles for Sport Development " put forward in Alberta Recreation and Park's Sport Development Policy (1983: 9) states that "the volunteer and volunteerism should be maintained as the basis of the sport delivery system". Across Canada amateur sport organizations at all levels; federal, provincial, regional, and municipal are run predominantly by volunteers.

In recent years there has been a growing debate concerning the nature of these voluntary sport organizations and their relation to the other agencies which comprise the Canadian sport delivery system, primarily the various levels of government. There has also been growing discussion about what is seen as the rapid change taking place in these voluntary sport organizations. The majority of these discussions refer to the increasing "rationalization" and subsequent "bureaucratization" of NSOs and PSOs. What were once predominantly volunteer run organizations are viewed as becoming increasingly professionalized - i.e., making use of paid professional staff to perform many technical and administrative functions.

The characteristics of this change have been both internal and external in nature. Internally the structures of volunteer sport organizations have evolved, developed, and generally become more complex than in the past. Accompanying these structural changes there has been a modification of organizational goals and an alteration of membership values and philosophies. For example, in many cases organizations which in the past exemplified a recreational, participatory approach to the organization of sport activity, now exhibit a philosophy which favors the development of high performance, elite sport through the activities of a small group of trained and often selectively recruited specialists.

Externally, the relationship between the environment or context within which volunteer sport organizations exist and the organizations themselves has become more interactive and demanding. Other organizations including provincial and federal government bureaucracies are becoming increasingly inter-connected with volunteer sport organizations. Note, for example, the establishment in 1970 of the state sponsored National Administrative Center for amateur sport organizations at 333 River Road in Ottawa. Kidd (1980) observed that in return for subsidized rent, grants for full-time administrative and professional employees and other specialized services in this center, the federal government wanted a veto on all professional appointments to positions within these organizations. Another example of this interdependence is the fact that public funding of volunteer sport organizations - which first appeared in a significant way in Alberta during the early 1970s - has become much more conditional. In Alberta the public funding upon which volunteer sport organizations have come to depend, is in the process of becoming a mechanism by which the provincial government encourages specific organizational behaviors and practices, such as the use of long range planning and systematic financial accounting.

To further elaborate the changes or transformations that have occurred in the delivery of amateur sport one may refer to a few of the recent studies in this area. For instance, the work of Macintosh and Franks (1982) and Franks and Macintosh (1983) examined the evolution of federal government policy and described how such policy came to transform sport. Broom (1984) undertook a description of the changing relationship between amateur sport and Canadian provincial governments. In addition, although less concerned with change per se, Nicholls (1982) described some of the factors impinging upon the structures and function of Western Canadian sport collectives. The aforementioned studies have been useful in documenting changes that have occurred relative to the delivery of amateur sport. However, for the most part these studies have been descriptive in nature and have not addressed the dynamics that underly the changes they have examined. Consequently the purpose of this study is not just to provide further documentation of the occurrence of change in the organization of amateur sport, it is also to initiate an analysis of the patterns of change in voluntary sport organizations.

The time has come to move beyond the descriptive, atheoretical approaches that have characterized past research in the area of amateur sport administration. The previous work in this area has provided a useful body of information, it is now desirable that this information be integrated into a systematic theoretical framework and that theory be utilized to direct further empirical research. Such a theoretical perspective is to be presented in this study. Specifically this study will apply a theory of organizational change to a population known as volunteer amateur sport organizations. The theoretical approach to be taken was developed by Greenwood and Hinings (1986) and is one that attempts to explain macro-organizational change. Central to this theory is the idea that organizations are comprised of both structural arrangements and definite sets of beliefs and values underlying these arrangements. Greenwood and Hinings' theory focuses on organizational design change, which they describe as a fundamental shift in these structural arrangements and the sets of beliefs and values underpinning these arrangements. The authors elaborate upon the notion of "design" by suggesting that the design of an organization constitutes a clustering of values, beliefs, and structural attributes. They go on to refer to these clusterings as "design archetypes" or as they are referred to in this study "paradigms", and to express interest in the dynamics that cause movement from one archetype to another.

The initiative for integrating a theory of organizational change into the examination of voluntary sport organizations was derived from two sets of related circumstances. The first set involves the evolution of a new conceptual approach to the study of organizational design within the discipline of Organizational Theory. Until recently the dominant schema for the analysis of organizations that of "contingency theory", had viewed organizational design as a consequence of situational circumstances. Greenwood and Hinings (1986) suggest that the comprehension of organizational design involved an understanding of critical contingencies and their impact on organizational arrangements. Challenging the position of contingency theory were the proponents of "strategic choice". Supporters of this approach (cf. Child, 1972) saw that organizational structures, rather than being wholly rational responses to environmental contingencies, were products of the social activity of human actors and were subject to their perception and interpretation. The new conceptual schema being proposed by scholars such as Miller and Friesen (1978), Ranson, Hinings, and Greenwood (1980), and Greenwood and Hinings (1986) called for a synthesis of both contingency theory and strategic choice.

The second set of circumstances revolved around the call by sport scholars (cf. Beamish, 1983; Slack, 1983) for research in the area of sport organization and administration to become more theoretically sophisticated. Typically the research in the area of sport and specifically volunteer sport organizations has been atheoretical and descriptive. Some studies have concentrated on providing lengthy non-critical accounts of the historical development of particular organizations. Other studies have been oriented toward accumulating collections of social and demographic facts concerning the membership of voluntary sport organizations.

An example of one piece of work which is more theoretically based than the type just described and which like the Greenwood and Hinings work attempts to link structure and agency is that of Hollands and Gruneau (1979). Their work is focussed on the resources that are afforded by the class structure as a way of explaining a range of socioeconomic patterns of recruitment to executive positions in Canadian Sport Governing Bodies. By utilizing the work of Anthony Giddens (1976, 1979), Hollands and Gruneau acknowledge the interactive effect between social structure and human actors. They emphasize the centrality of class and focus on the resources afforded by the class structure to explain why the structural arrangements of voluntary sport organizations are repressive and consequently why individuals with particular socioeconomic backgrounds have and continue to occupy positions of authority in these organizations.

Hollands and Gruneau give pre-eminence to the constraints of structure, both organizational and class, which limit the range of possibilities open to some actors to influence those very same structures. While not denying the often oppressive effect of structure upon the choices of organizational actors the approach to be used in this study suggests directions leading to a more elaborate explanation of the impact of both structure and agency.

To conclude this section, then, it should be noted that the two sets of circumstances outlined here are not unrelated. The common thread is the work of Anthony Giddens (1976, 1979). His efforts to reconcile the dichotomy between "social structure" and "human agency" have been acknowledged and utilized in the works of both sport scholars and organization scholars. If the dynamics which underly changes in the organization of amateur sport are to be more fully explained, then the approaches offered by sport and organization scholars must be integrated and extended. It will be useful to borrow the framework for examining change that is advocated by Greenwood and Hinings (1986). It is expected that the application of a theory of change that is specific to organizations will lead to a rich analysis of change in voluntary sport organizations.

II Statement of Research Problem

The purpose of this research is to develop an understanding of patterns of change in voluntary sport organizations. More specifically the focus is to examine the changes that have occurred over time in the structural arrangements of four voluntary sport organizations and the interpretive schemes (values and beliefs) that underly these arrangements. In order to examine the patterns of change the following sub-problems will be examined.

1. What are the dominant interpretive schemes (values and beliefs) held by organizational members?
2. What are the structural arrangements that characterize a particular voluntary sport organization?
3. Have environmental factors contributed to any

modification over time, of an organization's structural arrangements or its dominant interpretive scheme?

4. Have changes in an organization's dominant interpretive scheme been accompanied by modification of its structural arrangements, or vice versa?

5. Finally, based upon information generated by examination of the previous questions, are there any identifiable patterns of change emerging in voluntary sport organizations?

III Justification for Study

Apart from citing the traditional justification for tackling any new intellectual Everest, i.e., because it is there, many arguments can be made for pursuing research of this nature. As pointed out previously, amateur sport and the voluntary organizations that manage it are presently experiencing significant changes. At this time the implications and ramifications of this change are not clear. Scientific investigation leading to an understanding of why these changes are occurring, and what may be the results of these changes can only benefit those interested in the organizational development of Canadian amateur sport. An understanding of the patterns of change in voluntary sport organizations may also allow those concerned with the development and organization of amateur sport to make more informed decisions regarding the direction this development will take and to more fully appreciate the ramifications of their chosen modes of organizing.

From a conceptual standpoint two sets of circumstances combine to provide a strong case for undertaking a study of the nature of the one proposed. On the one hand sport scholars have not traditionally utilized theoretical approaches in their examination of voluntary sport organizations. On the other hand, sport and its organization is an area vastly under-researched by organization scholars. The present study attempts to apply a contemporary theoretical approach to an area where there is a relative paucity of theoretical research. It does so by acknowledging the need to consider the interactive effect of structure and agency when examining organizational change. As indicated by Giddens (1973) and Lukes (1974) any approach to the analysis of change that ignores the significance of either structure or agency must be viewed as inadequate. The framework proposed by Greenwood and Hinings, and chosen as the conceptual basis for this study, recognizes and attempts to account for the role of human agency and structure in the understanding of organizational change. It is seen, therefore, as a useful and relevant departure point for an examination of voluntary sport organizations. Finally, this study is useful in that it represents an initial attempt to empirically test the theoretical concepts of the Greenwood and Hinings' framework, and apply them to voluntary organizations.

IV Limitations and Delimitations

This study was limited by several factors. There were constraints imposed by economic considerations. The researcher's paucity of financial resources limited the study to an examination of voluntary sport organizations within the province of Alberta. This allowed considerable savings in terms of transportation since the central offices and key personnel tended to be located in Edmonton or Calgary.

There were constraints imposed by temporal considerations. The availability of information from both documentary and oral sources tended to decrease as the researcher sought data from the earlier years of the period of analysis. Some organizational documents from the earlier years were simply unavailable or untraceable.

There were constraints imposed by the procedures and instruments utilized in carrying out the research. More specifically this refers to constraints inherent in the use of personal correspondence and conversations, the interview techniques, document interpretation and analysis, and questionnaires. Further elaboration upon these constraints can be found in the section on methodology.

The study was delimited in many ways by virtue of conscious constraints imposed by the researcher. One of the first tasks in the study was the selection of appropriate organizations for examination. As noted earlier provincial level voluntary sport organizations were chosen for a number of reasons. First, they are large enough to have a relatively well developed organizational structure and old enough to have evolved a set of organizational beliefs and values. These provincial level organizations were also believed to be established long enough so that historical examination would uncover evidence of development and change. It was thought that seeking for such evidence in relatively new or undeveloped organizations would be problematic. Finally, the researcher's own involvement in sport both as a student and as a participant in many organizational planning seminars provided a good knowledge of the dynamics of this level of organization.

The time frame within which to situate this study was chosen with certain considerations in mind, each of which imposed constraints. The starting point of analysis was 1969 with the end point being the present year, 1986. Put briefly, the rationale for selecting this period of analysis involved an attempt to allow a sufficient length of time over which to observe organizational change, yet a short enough time period so that data collection would not become unwieldy. Additional considerations stemmed from the fact that the early 1970s saw the beginning of significant government involvement with amateur sport in Alberta. This provincial involvement was linked to the completion of the federal government's "Task Force Report" in 1969 which advocated a more active federal role concerning amateur sport. This federal initiative stimulated similar provincial initiatives. Provincial government involvement was seen prima facie as an important factor influencing change in the organization of amateur sport in Alberta.

Finally, the conscious selection of particular research methodologies imposed constraints upon the study. The impact of methodological techniques is discussed further in the section on methodology.

V Definition of Key Terms

Organzational Paradigm

The term paradigm generally means an interrelated pattern or set of elements. The notion of organizational paradigm used here stresses two related ideas. First, it emphasizes the development of structural coherence within organizations, and second, it provides a basis for classifying and interpreting patterns of organizational change, i.e., paradigm shifts.

Organizational paradigms can be thought of as the coalescence between an interpretive scheme and the pattern of structural arrangements supporting and reflecting that interpretive scheme.

Interpretive Scheme

Ranson et al. (1980) describe interpretive schemes as purposive values and beliefs that lie behind the implementation of structural frameworks. Interpretive schemes entail the taken for granted values and beliefs of organizational actors. These values and beliefs shape the purposive action of organizational members yet are typically unarticulated in daily activity (Ranson et al., 1980).

Organizational Structure

A commonly accepted notion of organizational structure focuses on differentiation of positions, formulation of rules and procedures, and prescriptions of authority (Ranson et al., 1980). This notion of structure was specified in the present study by utilizing the structural dimensions put forward by the Aston group (cf. Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, Macdonald, Turner, and Lupton, 1963). Three dimensions were utilized to determine the structural arrangements of the provincial sport organizations (PSOs).

The first was "specialization"; this dimension refers to the division of labour within the organization, the allocation of duties and tasks among a number of positions (Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, and Turner, 1968).

The second dimension was "standardization"; and it is concerned with the regularization of organizational procedures, the extent to which rules and procedures are written down and formalized (Pugh et al., 1968).

The third dimension was "centralization". This has to do with the locus of authority to make decisions, or the location in the hierarchy where decisions affecting the organization are made (Pugh et al., 1968).

Chapter II Review of Literature and Theoretical Overview

I Review of Literature

Introduction

Over the period of the past ten to fifteen years the federal and provincial governments have become increasingly involved in amateur sport. As a consequence, voluntary sport associations and the people that operate these organizations have been steadily challenged by new government policies, new technologies, new organizational arrangements, and new demands to improve efficiency and productivity. In order to meet these new challenges and demands sport organizations have had to adapt and change.

In the area of Sport Studies there has been a scarcity of work which has addressed the area of organizational change. Those sport scholars who have investigated this subject area have done so from perspectives which were predominantly atheoretical (cf. Baka, 1978; Nichols, 1982; and Broom, 1984). On the other hand scholars in the area of Organization Analysis who have undertaken theoretical work in the area of organizational change have not included in their research an examination of sport organizations. Consequently, this review will present an overview of the work of sport scholars related to the area of organizational change, and the research of organizational analysts whose work on change relates to the theoretical perspective used here. The intention will be to identify any literature related to organizational change in sport organizations, and also to identify the major themes that have led to the development of the theoretical approach being used in this study. The review will start with an examination of the literature on change in the area of sport studies followed by an examination of the organizational literature concerning change and adaptation.

A. The Sport Literature

In a historical sense the area of Sport Studies is a young discipline. In comparison to many more established areas of study scholarly enquiry into sport is underdeveloped. This is reflected both in the amount of research undertaken and the theoretical sophistication of that research. The research by sport scholars into the organization of sport and the dynamics within these organizations is no exception. Investigations dealing with amateur sport organizations have primarily concerned themselves with collecting demographic information on the membership of these organizations (cf. Bratton, 1970; Meisel and Lemieux, 1972; Beamish, 1978; Hollands and Gruneau, 1979; Slack, 1979). Therefore, in order to understand some of the factors that may influence voluntary sport organizations it as was seen as beneficial to also examine some of the work completed under this general heading.

Of the relatively small amount of scholarly research that has been completed on volunteers and voluntary organizations, the majority has been of an atheoretical, descriptive nature. According to Slack (1983: 6-8) this work can be categorized into three areas: "i) the creation of typologies, ii) the measuring of rates of participation in voluntary associations, and iii) the examination of the social characteristics of volunteers".

Within the first area, several researchers have constructed and/or dealt with typologies which distinguish qualitative differences among voluntary associations cf., Gordon and Babchuk (1959), Jacoby (1965), Warriner and Prather (1965), Simpson and Gully (1967), Booth, Babchuk and Knox (1968), and Babchuk and Booth (1969).

The most influential of these typologies has differentiated between two types of association, "instrumental" and "expressive". This typology was developed by Gordon and Babchuk (1959). Beamish in writing about sport organizations (1978: 4) summarized this differentiation by describing instrumental associations as "being concerned with the selection and implementation of long term goals and objectives, stressing efficiency and requiring more specialized skills for participation". In contrast expressive associations are more concerned with goals that are group or self-directed and their membership are interested in providing opportunities for action that bring immediate satisfaction through the activity of the group.

Among voluntary sport organizations examples of both instrumental and expressive associations have been found. Slack (1983) suggests that examples of the expressive type of association are organizations such as the St. Albert Bridge Club and the Edmonton Police Basketball League. Examples of instrumental voluntary associations are The Sports Federation of Canada and Sport Alberta (Slack, 1983). Bratton (1970) found in his examination of membership patterns of volleyball and swimming associations at the local, provincial, and national levels, that some executives interpret their participation as being instrumental, that is, supporting the larger social structure. However, Jacoby (1965) in his study of badminton and judo clubs found that their membership displayed an expressive orientation. There appears then to be some disagreement as to whether voluntary sport organizations are wholly instrumental or expressive.

Representative of work done in the second area cited by Slack i.e., the measurement of rates of participation in voluntary associations (cf. Hausknecht, 1962; Curtis, 1971; and Hyman and Wright, 1971), is Hausknecht's study which classifies North Americans as a culture whose members like to participate in voluntary associations. Slack (1983: 8) in observing the extent of voluntary activity in sport notes a 1981 Statistics Canada Survey which points out that "24.1% of people who volunteered did so in the category called "Leisure Activities" which included involvement in sport associations as well as other recreational type associations" (e.g., gaming clubs, social clubs, outdoor associations, etc.)

The third area of research, which contains the largest body of literature, deals with the relationship between rates of participation as the dependent variable and various other factors as independent variables. For example, Slack (1983: 9) notes that the following have been used as independent variables "socioeconomic status, gender, ethnicity, geographic location, and certain demographic factors (age, social origin, etc.)." Representative of this kind of work on voluntary organizations are studies by Foskett (1955); Freeman, Novak and Reeder (1957), Curtis (1959); Hagedorn and Labovitz (1967); Hodge and Freeman (1968); and Booth (1972). The majority of research pertaining to voluntary sport associations also falls into this third category and includes work by Bratton (1970); Meisel and Lemieux (1972); Beamish

(1978); Hollands and Gruneau (1979); Slack (1979) and Theberge (1980).

There is no common thread running through the sport related or non-sport related literature that pertains directly to the present theme of organizational change, nor was such a thread intended. This work was, for the most part, unconnected and each study or group of studies presented findings about the nature of voluntary organizations which were largely unrelated to the findings presented by other studies. Despite the lack of a theoretical consistency the information generated by these studies does have some relevance for the present research.

First, there is support from the Gordon and Babchuk instrumental - expressive classification system for the suggestion that certain values underpin certain organizational types. Second, from the studies which have examined the relationship of factors like gender and class to participation in voluntary organizations one finds that these organizations, like others, are influenced by the social context in which they exist. Finally, the studies on the extent of participation in voluntary organizations further supports the previous position taken in this research that these groups are worthy of more study than they have previously received.

The existence of this base of information coupled with the rise of two sets of circumstances has in part provided the impetus for this type of research into the structure and processes of voluntary sport organizations. The two sets of circumstances include, first, the fact that a number of authors have begun to examine and question the role of government in Canadian sport (cf. Kidd, 1980; Macintosh and Franks, 1982; Franks and Macintosh,1983; and Broom, 1984). Second, several writers have refered to the increasing bureaucratization of amateur sport (cf. Frisby 1982, 1983; Slack, 1983; and Macintosh, Franks, and

Bedecki 1986) but explanatory efforts have been limited. Taken together these studies indicate that amateur sport organizations are i) changing and becoming more rational and bureaucratized and ii) that governments (provincial and federal) are significant factors in promoting this process. Consequently there is a need to study the dynamics of this change from a more theoretical perspective. To date the only theoretical work on voluntary sport associations which focusses on organizational change is that of Hollands and Gruneau (1979) who studied social class and voluntary action in the administration of Canadian amateur sport; and Slack (1983) whose research was on the bureaucratization of a voluntary sport organization.

Hollands and Gruneau (1979) illustrate the utility of a theoretical approach using class analysis to study change in recruitment patterns to executive positions in Canadian voluntary sport organizations. Their work shows that there has been little change in these patterns. In their reference to the research identifying varying rates of athletic and administrative participation in different classes or status groups in societies, Hollands and Gruneau (1979) draw upon the work of Anthony Giddens. They discuss the degree to which rates of participation are dependent on human agency (different values and individual choices) or are the result of structural arrangements that limit the opportunities of social groups who share similar characteristics (occupational status, gender, ethinicity, etc.). Thus Hollands and Gruneau in their work acknowledge the interaction between human agency and social structure.

The integration of Giddens into their theoretical framework links the work of Hollands and Gruneau with the framework which will be used to examine organizational change in this study. Hollands and Gruneau recognize the interactive relationship between human agency and "social structure" and how this contributes to an understanding of social change. The framework for examining change, to be introduced later, recognizes the interactive relationship between human agency and "organizational structure" and how this may contribute to an understanding of organizational change.

The other recent piece of work examining voluntary sport organizations from a theoretical perspective is that of Slack (1983). Drawing on the Weberian concept of bureaucracy Slack examined the rationalization and emergence of bureaucratic characteristics in a voluntary sport organization. His results showed that bureaucratization was taking place through a process termed the routinization of charisma. Slack suggested that the process of bureaucratization occurs more quickly in voluntary sport organizations than it does in other types of organizations.

To this point the research work of a number of scholars in both the fields of Sport and Voluntary Organizations has been examined. In the area of sport there appears to be a general recognition that voluntary sport organizations are undergoing a process of rationalization (cf. Hollands and Gruneau, 1979; Kidd, 1980; and Slack, 1983).

Through this process of rationalization the structure and processes of voluntary sport organizations are changing. There is a need to understand this change. The discipline of Organizational Theory offers approaches which are applicable to the analysis of change in voluntary sport organizations. Greenwood and Hinings (1986) propose such a theory of organizational change. They draw on Giddens' (1976,

1979) theory of structuration as a means of integrating the structural and human agency approaches. Drawing upon previous work by Ranson et al., (1980) Greenwood and Hinings suggest that a synthesis of the "structural" - "interactionist" dichotomy will allow a truer understanding of organizations by conceiving of them as a product of the interplay between structure and interaction.

B. The Organization Literature

Traditionally the literature concerning organizational change has stemmed from one of two perspectives, that of contingency theory or that of strategic choice theory. Contingency theorists sought to understand the various arrangements or structures of organizations and how environmental contingencies seemed to influence them. From the perspective of strategic choice researchers emphasized the pre-emminence of the actor, the individual or individuals who managed the organization. The role of managerial perception of the environment and of managerial decision making was examined in order to explain changes in organization structure.

More recently there has been recognition of the need for theories of change to incorporate the assumptions of both contingency and strategic choice theories (cf. Ranson et. al., 1980 and Greenwood and Hinings, 1986). The focus of recent research has been to recognize the interactive affect of both the organizational actor and organizational structure on the production of organizational reality. This integrative approach has led to increasing interest in the notion of organizational paradigms, or as they have been called elsewhere, organizational "archetypes" (Miles and Snow, 1978), "configurations" (Miller and

Friesen (1980a), and "design types" (Greenwood and Hinings, 1986). These descriptions, though varied, possess a common view of organizations as entities whose elements of structure, strategy, and context or environment have a tendency to cohere into discernable patterns. The following review will briefly outline the various conceptual approaches taken in the literature towards explaining organizational paradigms and organizational change.

A connecting thread running through the literature on change is the idea that the structural characteristics and processes of an organization have a coherence, or patterning. Miller and Friesen (1984) propose that there are a limited number of configurations of structure, strategy and environment with which organizations operate. They go on to suggest that within these configurations; structures, production systems, information systems, strategies, and environments all tend to influence each other. All these elements interact in a way that produces a finite number of distinct configurations or "quantum states" (Miller and Friesen, 1984). In a similar vein Miles and Snow (1978) refer to organizational "archetypes". These organizational forms are defined by the consistency between an archetype's strategy for reacting to the environment and its particular configuration of technology, structure, and process. Mintzberg (1979) suggests the notion of a "pure type" or "structural configuration". He describes a situation where organizations are driven towards one of a limited number of configurations in order to attain structural harmony. The conceptual approaches outlined vary in terminology but are theoretically consistent. The common underlying idea is that the structural attributes and processes of an organization have a coherence.

Miller and Friesen (1984) note the tendency of organizations operating within a particular configuration to develop a "momentum" which holds the organization within the parameters of that configuration. This concept is important to the analysis of organizational change. Miller and Friesen (1984) observe that emerging organizational tendencies, whatever their direction, tend to have momentum associated with them. Greenwood and Hinings (1986) suggest that it is momentum which holds the organization within the parameters of the interpretive scheme and as a result makes reorientation unlikely. Miller and Friesen (1984) propose that momentum is a central feature of organizational change in so far as it makes change difficult. They outline a body of literature which points out the many potential causes of momentum. It is interesting to note that the rationales given for the existence of momentum include arguments from the basis of ideology; arguments from the basis of contingencies; and arguments from the basis of political power and control. These are all central elements of the framework from which change will be examined in the present research.

Several writers have suggested reasons for the existence of organizational momentum, i.e., the development of a consistency in organizational form. Some authors have shown that organizational ideologies determine how organizations evolve (cf. Clark, 1972; and Mitroff and Kilmann, 1976). Others propose that organizational orientations consist of narrow, self justifying views of reality that reproduce past behaviors (cf. Wilensky, 1967; Watson, 1969; Wildavsky, 1972; and Argyris and Schon, 1977). Greenwood and Hinings (1986) argue that, based upon the logic of task accomplishment, certain coherent organizational forms will work well in certain circumstances.

Pettigrew (1973, 1974) finds that political coalitions in organizations often have vested interests in developing strategies that will maintain the status quo. Ranson et al. (1980) suggest that struggles for resources connect to structural arrangements by providing some actors preferential access to key decision processes and therefore the ability to preserve and reproduce patterns of advantage.

Miller and Friesen (1984) propose that momentum is pervasive and is likely to co-exist among a great many variables of strategy and structure at the same time. They refer to many studies which show that there are integral relationships among environmental, organizational, and strategy-making variables. The following authors show a close interdependency between features of the organization and aspects of its environment (cf. Burns and Stalker, 1961; Woodward, 1965; Lawrence and Lorch, 1967; Thompson, 1967; Khandwalla, 1972, 1973; and Mintzberg, 1979).

Others have pointed out similar interdependencies between aspects of strategy and structure (cf. Chandler, 1962; Channon, 1973; Mintzberg, 1973; Rumelt, 1974; Paine and Anderson, 1977; and Miles and Snow, 1978).

Greenwood and Hinings (1986) identify two interpretations of the meaning of "momentum", one which describes momentum as a "gravitational pull" towards a paradigm type, and the other termed "configurational consolidation" which refers to the heightening of design characteristics. The former entails an increasing consistency between organizational systems and structures with underlying interpretive schemes. The latter refers to the tendencies of organizations to continually heighten their structural design and increase their propensities along each structural variable (Greenwood and Hinings, 1986). The fundamental implication discerned by Greenwood and Hinings is that organizations do not easily move from the assumptions of a particular paradigm orientation.

The organization literature lends theoretical and empirical support to the following propositions. One, there is a consistency between structural characteristics, environmental features, and strategic value orientations. Various authors have based their conceptualizations of organizational paradigm upon the interaction of these elements. Second, because these paradigm orientations within which organizations operate are difficult to re-mold, a certain momentum develops. However as Greenwood and Hinings (1986) note reorientations of paradigms or design types can and do occur. In order to properly examine organizational change they suggest it is necessary to be able to discern between paradigm inertia and paradigm reorientation. For this to occur there is need for the development of a language which addresses the problems of organizational change and inertia to change of this type. The theoretical overview which follows outlines the manner in which the author of this study integrates the Greenwood and Hinings approach into the examination of organizational change in provincial sport organizations

II Theoretical Overview

The purpose of the following section is to review the theoretical approach that has been chosen as the basis of this research. The review will include a description and explanation of the concepts that are central to the theory of change proposed by Greenwood and Hinings (1986). These concepts include:

A. Organizational Paradigms
B. Interpretive Scheme
C. Momentum
D. Tracks

A. Organizational Paradigms

The concept of organizational paradigm was developed in order to provide a means of identifying organizational transition or change. The term paradigm refers here to an interrelated pattern or set of organizational elements.

Greenwood and Hinings (1986) draw upon the work of Giddens (1976, 1979) as a means of integrating the human agency and structural approaches. The unit of analysis in their work is the organization. Drawing upon previous work by Ranson et al. (1980), Greenwood and Hinings suggest that a synthesis of the human agency - structure dichotomy will allow a truer understanding of organizations by conceiving of them as a product of the interplay between these two factors. They propose the notion of an organizational paradigm which can be identified in terms of the underlying beliefs and values (interpretive schemes) manifest by the organizational members and the meaning and coherence which these interpretive schemes give to the composition of the organization's structural arrangements. However, rather than simply emphasizing the identification of specific paradigms, the authors focus upon the incidence and nature of movement from one paradigm to another. They are interested in organizational change and the dynamics which constrain and drive that change.

Drawing upon Miller and Friesen's (1984) concept of "configuration" and Miles and Snow's (1978) concept of "archetype", the notion of paradigm presented by Greenwood and Hinings (1986) stresses the idea that the interpretive schemes and associated structural attributes of an organization have a coherence or common orientation. Therefore a paradigm can be thought of as the juxtaposition between a cluster of values and beliefs (interpretive schemes) and a pattern of structural elements that support and express those values and beliefs. Greenwood and Hinings (1986) also suggest there is a tendency for organizations operating with a given set of values and beliefs to develop a set of structures that are associated with that interpretive scheme. This conception of organizational paradigm is founded upon the idea that structural arrangements form a pattern and that a comprehension of the parts within the pattern can be thoroughly understood only in relation to the total paradigm (Greenwood and Hinings, 1986). This paradigm then consists of a synthesis between structure and interpretive schemes and it is in terms of this coherence that organizational paradigms should be considered.

An examination of the organization literature draws attention to several authors who, to a greater or lesser degree, provide evidence suggesting there is a finite number of organizational paradigms, each identifiable by the patterns of its constituent elements. Miles and Snow (1978) proposed a simple classification based upon archetypical combinations of strategy and structures, these being "defenders, propectors, analyzers and reactors". Mintzberg (1979) proposed a classification consisting of five basic types; machine bureaucracy, professional bureaucracy, the divisionalized form, adhocracies, and simple structures. These types were classified on the basis of three elements, coordinating mechanisms, design parameters, and contingency factors (Mintzberg, 1979). The utility of broad, generalizeable design types or paradigms is accepted; in this way a basis for comparison is established for the examination of organizational transitions or change. In this study it will however be necessary to remain aware of the potentially unique nature of voluntary sport organizations. The research may show that voluntary sport organizations develop specific paradigm types. The degree to which these paradigms may be applicable to other types of organizations can only be a matter of conjecture at this point. It is suggested, however, that paradigms identified in the course of this study will be applicable to voluntary sport organizations in particular, and perhaps to voluntary organizations in general.

The concept of organizational paradigm implies a tendency for organizations operating with a given interpretive scheme to develop a set of structures that are associated with that interpretive scheme. Greenwood and Hinings (1986) put forward two arguments for expecting organizations to develop this consistency between structure and interpretive schemes; the logic of task accomplishment and the logic of political control.

The central argument from task is that structural consistency arises because it facilitates task performance (Greenwood and Hinings, 1986). Both Miles and Snow (1978) and Miller and Friesen (1984) support this general argument. Using Mintzberg's (1979) concept of machine bureaucracy as an example it is suggested that certain basic organizational types can be distinguished by the patterning of particular organizational elements. For instance, in a certain environmental situation the integrated use of standardized procedures, hierarchy of authority, detailed specialization, etc. will work well for an organization in achieving its ends. An illustration from Greenwood and Hinings (1986) suggests that a machine bureaucracy is appropriate for large organizations facing a stable environment in which the prominent issues are price, predictability of production and delivery, and in which the maintainance of stability is appropriate.

To situate this example in the context of a voluntary sport organization the following illustration can be used. The growing involvement of the provincial government in the affairs of voluntary sport organizations has led to a transference of bureaucratic ideals such as financial accountability, efficiency, and rational management to a pool of values and beliefs already held by these organizations. Coupled with this transfer of values and beliefs is a growing dependence by voluntary sport organizations upon the resources provided by the provincial government. There is a growing need for sport organizations to incorporate the bureaucratic systems proposed by the provincial government in order that they may acquire the resources necessary to undertake the tasks with which they are charged. Put another way, this argument from task emphasizes the need for internal structural consistency appropriately aligned with the situational circumstances in order to achieve task accomplishment.

The second argument is that which is concerned with the logic of political control. Drawing upon Miles and Snow (1978) Greenwood and Hinings (1986) suggest an organization should not be viewed as a stated purpose with established mechanisms for achieving that purpose. Rather the organization should be seen as a political system composed for various interest groups seeking to establish and maintain claims upon scarce and valued resources (cf. Cyert and March, 1963; and Pfeffer, 1978). Competition for resources, however, is not "free", but constrained by certain norms or "rules of the game" about what constitutes appropriate behavior (Greenwood and Hinings, 1986). These "rules of the game" are connected to structural arrangements which provide preferential access to key decision processes, distribution of influence and dependence and thus the ability to preserve and reproduce a pattern of inequality (Walsh, Hinings, Greenwood, and Ranson, 1981; and Clegg and Dunkerly, 1982). Greenwood and Hinings, (1986) propose that underlying these structural arrangements are values and beliefs about the purpose of the organization, and about the type of organization best suited to achieve these goals. Organizational structures reflect an underlying ideology and by controlling that ideology, the dominant factions preserve and maintain positions of privilege, therefore a hegemony of ideas exist (Greenwood and Hinings, 1986).

Examples of such hegemonies exist in the context of sport organizations. For instance, several authors have indicated that women are significantly under-represented in the executives of national and provincial sport organizations (cf. Hollands and Gruneau, 1979; Theberge, 1980; Beamish, 1983; and Slack, 1983). The majority of executives of provincial and national sports organizations are male. Consequently the structures of these organizations are strongly imbued with hegemonic values of a patriarchal nature e.g. beliefs about questions of sexuality, masculinity, femininity, and of the unequal division of resources (Beamish, 1983). However, in recent years many of these patriarchal assumptions about males and females in sport organizations have been challenged (Beamish, 1983). Nevertheless,

7

Beamish (1983) observes that individuals who wish to challenge these existing structures are confronted with a very conservative inertia when working for change within the traditional patriarchal sport structures because this type of realignment challenges the privileged positions of individuals (usually male) who have controlled these organizations.

Such examples, then, illustrate the utility of the concept of paradigm to the situation of amateur sport organizations. The notion of paradigm, however, with its emphasis on coherence between structure and the values and beliefs underlying structure requires a further elaboration of its constituent elements. It is to this elaboration that we now turn.

B. Interpretive Schemes

Greenwood and Hinings (1986) suggest that an organizational paradigm can represent both a political hegemony and a consistent, task oriented structure. In other words for both task and political purposes the development of internally consistent paradigms can be expected. The question remains as to how organizational paradigms are to be identified and distinguished. Ranson et al. (1980) stress the purposive element of organizational paradigms by viewing structures as embodiments of values and beliefs which constitute a prevailing "interpretive scheme". Interpretive schemes may be described as the purposive values and beliefs that lie behind the implementation of structural frameworks. Interpretive schemes entail the values and beliefs taken for granted by organizational actors (Ranson et al., 1980). These values and beliefs shape the purposive action of organizational members yet are typically unarticulated in daily activity (Ranson et al., 1980). Therefore, according to Greenwood and Hinings (1986) classification and identification of an organizational paradigm becomes a matter of isolating these clusters of ideas and values (interpretive schemes) and the structural attributes associated with them.

An examination of the literature shows illustrations of organizational structures which have been given meaning and coherence by underlying values and beliefs. Here, specific reference is made to sport and leisure organizations. Cunningham (1984), in his study of a privately owned recreation club catering to the higher income bracket, suggested that the organization's membership recruitment system reflected the values expressed by the top management. These values included certain beliefs about what kind of people should be allowed to join the club, e.g., people from a background of higher socioeconomic status, people with specific ideas about what constitutes proper social conduct, individuals with particular ideas about what is the best way to organize, etc. The recruitment system was designed so as to filter out people who did not fit this mold (i.e., high membership fees, behavior codes, credit checks, sponsorship requirements, etc.). This particular component of the organization's structure was underpinned by a set of values as to what should be.

Organizations, however, do not always operate with all-encompassing, unified sets of values (Ranson et al. 1980). Within an organization there are very often factions with various preferences about goals and modes of operation. The stage for change is constantly set due to continous competition among distinctive sets of values. Moreover, the notion of a coherence between particular sets of ideas and values and structural arrangements provides a basis for distinguishing organizational paradigms. The starting point for identification and classification is the underlying interpretive scheme.

C. Momentum

Organizations find it difficult to break from traditional patterns of values and beliefs. The interpretive schemes held (often unconsciously) by organizational executives mold and curtail their comprehension of organizational activities. It is seldom that groups or individuals are allowed to question the basic ongoing activities of their organizations. According to Miles and Snow (1978), in order to create expanded awareness of organizational operations "double loop" learning, where present behavior and its underlying causes are clearly examined, must occur. Organizational learning of this kind is difficult for it requires executives to systematically examine not just the results of decision making, but the processes by which these decisions are reached thereby determining the organization's capabilities and deficiencies (Miles and Snow, 1978).

The inability of organizations to break from prevailing practices and beliefs may be attributed to strategies organizations employ to interpret their environments. Organizations interpret their worlds in terms of interpretive schemes which explain the environment in causal terms and elicit appropriate responses (Greenwood and Hinings, 1986). The result is organizational momentum and a failure to learn. Momentum refers to the tendency of organizations to move toward structural coherence, a process which is strengthened further by the prevailing system of values and beliefs. Momentum implies that organizations develop an internal coherence among structural elements, and that they become ensnared within the prevailing hegemony of ideas and logic of task accomplishment (Greenwood and Hinings, 1986).

It must be noted that the possibility of change is not denied by the concept of momentum, as organizations are continually adjusting their structures in order to ensure internal coherence. Greenwood and Hinings (1986) propose two ways in which to examine the possibility of organizational change. On one hand change may involve the heightening of fit between the interpretive scheme of an organization and its structure. In this sense change is characterized by the strengthening of a paradigm which is referred to as "design inertia" or "intra-paradigmatic change" (Greenwood and Hinings, 1986).

This concept can be understood by referring to the present situation of voluntary sport organizations in Alberta. The majority of these organizations have come to accept to a greater or lesser degree the need to adopt bureaucratic ideals pertaining to organizational efficiency, accountability and control, technical rationality, and managerial effectiveness based on quantitative criteria. The notion of "design inertia" or "intra-paradigmatic" change can be grasped by imagining what the long term development of a voluntary sport organization that stresses these ideals over time might look like. In order to maintain a high level of control efficiency and managerial effectiveness such an organization would be required to change its structure and systems in response to various contingency factors such as size and changes in the external environment. For instance, an increase in numbers of members might require that the organization increase its level of differentiation. However, as long as the dominant interpretive scheme embraces and reflects the ideals of control, efficiency and rational definitions of effectiveness, this change in the level of differentiation would not occur at the expense of control or managerial effectiveness. There is change, but it occurs within the same basic framework. This type of change (intra-paradigmatic) is seen by Greenwood and Hinings as being the most common.

The second type of change to which Greenwood and Hinings (1986) refer occurs when organizations move from one paradigm to another. This is called "inter-paradigmatic" change. This concept can be understood if one considers the historical development of voluntary sport organizations in Canada. At one time, in the era of what was referred to in the "Task Force Report" as "kitchen table" administration, amateur sport organizations emphasized volunteerism and participatory management. Accompanying these values and ideas about organizing were internal arrangements that were simple, loosely structured and informal in nature. This structure could be described as organic (Burns and Stalker, 1961). Over time, the emphasis in voluntary sport organizations seems to have shifted from a belief in volunteerism and participatory management to a belief in rationality, control, and managerial efficiency. The informal structures that at one time characterized these organizations are being replaced by more bureaucratic structures that emphasize centralization of control, accountability, and formalized systems. Change can be seen as occurring at two levels; the level of structure - changes in organizational arrangements - and the level of interpretive schemes - changes in values and beliefs about organizing. Greenwood and Hinings (1986) identify three reasons as to why organizations are unable to recognize their prevailing assumptions and adapt easily to new structural arrangements.

The first explanation assumes that the organization and its membership do not recognize the need for reorientation. According to Weick (1979), Hedberg (1981), and Starbuck (1983) structures and processes are often designed to monitor selectively and may overlook vital information. Where relevant information is detected it is interpreted in terms of the prevailing interpretive scheme. This may lead to the organization trying to solve new problems with old solutions, or trying to re-interpret new problems such that they resemble forms that can be dealt with by existing methods (Miles and Snow, 1978). The second explanation assumes that the need for reorientation may by recognized, but subject to the analysis of costs and benefits. According to Miller and Friesen (1984) in order to justify the comprehensive structural changes that may be necessary to re-attain harmony among structural elements, these changes must be delayed until the cost of not restructuring becomes prohibitive.

The third explanation concerns the realization that organizations are political systems in which factions representing specific interests sustain their position of power through a hegemony of ideas reflected and supported by structural arrangements (Greenwood and Hinings, 1986). It is suggested that the privileged factions maintain their interests and positions by blocking structural reorientation. Attempts to reorientate an organizational paradigm will have to overcome the efforts of the dominant interests to maintain the status quo. According to Miles and Snow (1978), existing patterns of organizational behavior have been created by, and serve the interests of, those very organizational members who have the power to change them.

Thus, it is suggested that organizational development follows a pattern of momentum whereby a consistency among structural components arises based upon an underlying interpretive scheme. The values and beliefs comprising the interpretive scheme serve as a filter which determines the shape and content of organizational knowledge and simultaneously serves the interests of the dominant faction.

D. Tracks

The central concern of the theory presented by Greenwood and Hinings is the incidence, nature, and causes of movements between paradigms. The main empirical focus of the present study will be to establish the existence of paradigm types and on the basis of these types observe whether over the time of the study paradigm reorientation occurred. From that point inference will be made as to the nature and causes of paradigm reorientation, keeping in mind the distinctions that have to be made between structural adjustment and paradigm reorientation.

Greenwood and Hinings (1986) provide a set of concepts and terms with which to explore the possible movements between organizational paradigms. The concept of track is introduced as a means of charting and explaining the occurrence and cause of movement between different organizational paradigms. Tracks can be described as the relationship over time of an organization to one or more paradigms. Tracks plot organizational movements between paradigms and also signify the absence of such movement. There are two aspect of "tracks" that must be explained in order to fully understand the process of change within an organization over a given period of time.

Interpretive Decoupling

The first aspect is what they refer to as the configuration of interpretive decoupling. This notion describes the degree to which interpretive schemes are detached from corresponding structures. For example, take a bureaucratically structured organization (high degree of specialization, standardization, and a hierarchical authority structure) whose upper management is suddenly replaced by new individuals who favor high risk strategies and who implement loose and informal decision making processes. The new interpretive scheme could be described as loosely coupled with the existing structures.

Further elaboration of the concept of interpretive decoupling assumes that two paradigms are available to an organization at a given time. Greenwood and Hinings (1984) suggest a three-fold classification based upon the organization's proximity to one or the other of the available paradigms. Let us call the two paradigms available to a voluntary sport organization "A" and "B". Paradigm A may feature an interpretive scheme which emphasizes informality, participatory management, and values and beliefs based on group democracy. Accompanying this interpretive scheme would be a corresponding set of structural arrangements characterized by structural simplicity, and which could be described as organic in nature (cf. Mintzberg, 1979). Paradigm B, on the other hand, may feature an interpretive scheme that emphasizes formality, standardization, credentialism, and values and beliefs based on hierarchical control. Corresponding to this interpretive scheme would be a distinct set of structural arrangements characterized by structural complexity and which could be described as bureaucratic in nature.

Paradigms A and B represent positions at each end of the organizational track. These respective paradigms represent organizations whose structural elements are consistent with their corresponding interpretive schemes. With regard to an organization's proximity to one or the other of two paradigms Greenwood and Hinings (1984) identify two additional positions or types of interpretive decoupling that may exist between paradigms A and B. These two positions between A and B represent an organization whose structural arrangements have varying degrees of consistency with their underlying interpretive schemes. This variance ranges from near coherence - embryonic A or embryonic B - where an organization is primarily operating within the assumptions of a particular interpretive scheme but has not attained complete structural consistency, to non-coherence - schizoid - where the configuration of structural elements reflects contradictory sets of interpretive schemes.

An organization may be in an embryonic relationship to a paradigm if a small number of the structural elements of the organization are decoupled from its prevailing interpretive schemes. For instance, a voluntary sport organization which stresses informality and participatory management may, for a number of reasons including frequent interaction with government agencies, take on a small number of bureaucratic characteristics that are inconsistent with the prevailing organizational interpretive scheme which stresses informality and participatory management. Such an organization would be in the embryonic A configuration of interpretive decoupling. A sport organization in the embryonic B type of interpretive decoupling would have definitely changed its interpretive scheme yet would still retain some structural elements that reflect the previously held interpretive scheme.

Finally, an organization might be in a schizoid relationship if its configuration of structural attributes reflects the tension of two or more contradictory sets of interpretive schemes. Organizations exhibiting this type of interpretive decoupling are viewed as midway between paradigms. A sport organization at this stage would be characterized by conflict over the ascendancy of particular interpretive schemes and possibly by loose coupling between interpretive schemes and structural arrangements. For example, a sport organization may have a highly bureaucratic structure. The requirements for advancement of say a coach may be formalized, standardized, and require the completion of several theoretical and practical examinations. However, few individuals within the organization may actually support and abide by these formalized patterns. The majority may strongly believe that advancement should be based upon experience and success rather than formal accreditation. In this case lip service may be paid to the formal structure in the form of quickly passing people through the process and handing them their "accreditation". Alternately the majority may act in direct violation of the formal processes, in the form of advancing individuals based on a subjective evaluation of their experience and success. In either case, the organization can be said to be schizoid since it is structured to operate according to an interpretive scheme that is completely different and contradictory to the interpretive scheme that is actually in place.

Structural Detachment

Discussion of the second aspect of "tracks" requires a preliminary explanation of the concepts of "emergent" and "prescribed" structure. Although these concepts are not empirically dealt with in this study (both are assumed to be parts of "structure") an understanding of their relation to the Greenwood and Hinings framework will aid theoretical comprehension.

At the structural level of the organization Greenwood and Hinings (1984) make the distinction between prescribed and emergent structure. The prescribed structure acts as a set of rules and resources drawn upon to support and legitimate particular courses of action and patterns of interaction. The prescribed structure is the official, formal guide to organizational operation. It should be noted that the prescribed framework does not cover all possible behavior, action, and relationships. There exists within even the tightest prescribed framework scope for interaction that is not officially sanctioned. This interaction occurs within that which Greenwood and Hinings (1984) refer to as the emergent structure. The impossibility of complete specification within the formal prescribed framework and the inevitable outgrowth of an emergent structure leads to the potential of "loose coupling" between the prescribed framework and the actual emergent interactions (Greenwood and Hinings, 1984). It is through this process of loose coupling that prescribed frameworks are subject to change and possibly replacement (Greenwood and Hinings, 1984).

The second aspect of tracks that Greenwood and Hinings (1984) draw attention to is the "sequence of structural detachment". This is the order in which prescribed and emergent patterns can become detached from the prevailing interpretive schemes of an organization and as such aid in understanding the dynamics of change. Greenwood and Hinings (1984) suggest three possible sequences of structural detachment.

The first sequence is referred to as "simultaneous reorientation". This sequence is characterized by a track in which reorientation occurs simultaneously at both the emergent and prescribed levels. The transition between paradigms is smooth, unproblematic, and unnoticed

(Greenwood and Hinings, 1984).

The second sequence is referred to as "prescribed-emergent". In this sequence prescribed structures begin to dissolve their ties with and become detached from the underlying interpretive schemes. According to Greenwood and Hinings (1984) such a sequence begins because an organization finds it necessary to adjust a limited range of structures in order to cope with a changed environment. It could be suggested that the sequence of structural detachment is characteristic of at least one pattern of change that has taken place in voluntary sport organizations. For instance, it can be shown that recent changes in federal and provincial government sport policies have influenced structural change. The recent emphasis that federal and provincial governments have placed on planning has encouraged some voluntary sport organizations to develop administrative systems to handle this aspect of their operations. However, the underlying interpretive schemes of some members of these groups are still comprised of values and beliefs supporting a less rational and structured approach to planning. Consequently, reorientation of the prescribed structural elements occurs while at the emergent level links are still with an earlier interpretive scheme.

The third sequence of structural detachment is "emergent-prescribed". In this case emergent structures become detached from the prevailing interpretive schemes. Greenwood and Hinings (1984) suggest that such a sequence will be followed where the task situation alters leaving the existing organizational design inappropriate for effective task accomplishment. Examples of this can be found in voluntary sport organizations that until recently have been predominantly male in composition. These organizations with their traditionally patriarchal interpretive schemes have had to face and accomodate the inclusion and integration of large numbers of female participants. New emergent patterns of interaction have arisen in order to deal with new task situations. These new task situations often expose the existing organizational design with its underlying patriarchal interpretive scheme, as inappropriate for effective task accomplishment.

D. Summary

In summary the selection of the Greenwood and Hinings approach was made based on the belief that it would provide a theoretical framework for examining the dynamics of change in voluntary sport organizations. Their perspective recognizes the need to address the role of agency and structure in order to come to an understanding of change, in this case organizational change. Their framework provides a detailed conceptual vocabulary which is sensitive to the complexity of factors influencing change, but which is also coherent and systematic enough to allow translation to methods which can inform empirical enquiry.

Chapter III. Methodology

I Introduction

Once the theoretical framework for the study was established it was then necessary to develop an appropriate methodology which would allow empirical testing of the proposed relationships. The methods chosen were developed with the intent of applying them to the examination of change in voluntary sport organizations.

II Research Methods

The choice of a methodological approach for this study, as with any research, involved a number of compromises and trade-offs. The array of research designs available to the investigator involved in research into organizations is extensive. Labovitz and Hagedorn (1976) categorize research designs in terms of three broad conceptual types: experiments, cases studies, and surveys. Each type of design has its strengths and weaknesses. An experimental design is characterized by a significant amount of control. This control is extended over the independent variable and over extraneous factors. The use of an experimental design with the attendant control groups, matching techniques, randomization, pretests and post tests reduces the chance of interpreting the results inaccurately (Labovitz and Hagedorn, 1976). Experiments, however, can rarely be used in social research. The groups of people are simply too large, inferences from experimental designs are limited and cannot be accurately applied to large populations. In addition, the practise of placing people in small prearranged and often intense settings may sensitize the individuals so that they are no longer representative of their original population (Labovitz and Hagedorn, 1976).

The bulk of social research into organizations makes use of designs incorporating the survey or the case study method. In comparison with experiments, surveys allow for a high degree of representativeness but a low degree of control over exatraneous variables. The reason for the representativeness is the employment (usually) of a random sampling technique. The reason for the low degree of control over extraneous variables is the fact that surveys do not usually have experimental and control groups - that is, other variables besides the independent variables may have produced the changes in the dependent variable.

The case study when compared to the experiment is low on control over extraneous variables for the same reason as the survey. The case study, because it includes a sample of only one, is also low in representativeness when compared to the survey. It is difficult to differentiate between cause and effect, and inference from the intensive study of one of a few cases involves a high and generally unknown amount of risk (Labovitz and Hagedorn, 1976). However, the major advantage of a case study is the ability to produce an organizational picture that is rich in descriptive information. The results of case studies can often furnish intuitive hypotheses that may be then tested under more rigorous designs.

The selection of a research design, then, involves certain compromises and trade-offs. By conducting an intensive case study of a single organization using multiple methods of participant observation and survey interviews, one could produce an organizational picture of richer dimensions than any other approach. On the other hand a sample survey of a general organizational population would allow greater generalization of the results. In selecting the design for this study a compromise was chosen. Essentially the approach chosen was that of the case study. However, in order to provide some degree of generalizability it was decided to use a sample of four organizations.

III Sample Selection

The four organizations were chosen from a larger population of approximately seventy voluntary sport organizations located in Alberta. Volunteer sport organizations from the provincial level, as opposed to national level organizations, were chosen for a number of reasons. First the provincial organizations were much more accessible than their national counterparts would have been. This accessibility was both in terms of information and physical distance. Second, the provincial organizations chosen were of sufficient size and complexity to have exhibited the type of change with which this study was concerned. The organizations were chosen in a non-random, purposive manner with the intent of studying organizational change. Those chosen were larger and older than the majority of their counterparts. The organizations chosen for study were the Alberta Volleyball Association (AVA), the Alberta Soccer Association (ASA), the Canadian Amateur Swimming Association Alberta Section (CASA-AS), and the Canadian Figure Skating Association Alberta Section (CFSA-AS). Since organizational growth (in terms of increased specialization, increased membership, increased budgets, increased standardization, increased professionalization, etc.) is a relatively recent phenomenon among provincial volunteer sport organizations it seemed logical that selecting large organizations would ensure that the sample included organizations which would display enough growth and change to make the study meaningful. Also, larger older organizations tend to exhibit a greater complexity of structures accompanied by more established value systems, all of which provided richer ground for an analysis of the type undertaken.

IV The Development of Data Gathering Instruments

In regard to the selection of data gathering techniques it was found that other studies of change (cf. Miller and Friesen, 1980b; and Quinn and Anderson, 1984) had been conducted using interviews and documentary analysis as the main techniques. Since these methods have proven to be effective they were chosen for use in this study.

The collection of data, through the two data gathering techniques identified, was specifically concerned with developing information about the structural arrangements of the organizations, the interpretive schemes which underly these arrangements and the environment within which the organizations operate. The methodological approaches used to gather information about structure, values and environmental conditions were developed jointly by Rob Pitter, Trevor Slack and the author of this study. In regard to the structural arrangements of organizations a review of recent work in this area (cf. Mintzberg, 1979; Ranson et al., 1980; and Daft, 1983) showed that a number of different analytical categories of structure have been used in past studies. On the basis of their applicability to voluntary sport organizations and in the interests of brevity three analytical categories were selected, these being: the degree of task specialization; the degree of task standardization; and the level of centralization/decentralization of decision making within the organization.

Unlike other work in organizational studies this research did not merely apply these analytical categories across the whole organization. Often researchers treat organizations as if they were homogeneous entities, and consideration is not given to the fact that different subunits within the organization operate and are structured differently (Pitter, Slack, and Cunningham, 1985). For example, in a voluntary sport organization the subunit concerned with the development of athletes may be highly standardized. Pitter et al., (1985) suggest that if an individual who was highly involved with this system or one who saw it as the main focus of the organization was asked how standardized the organization was, he/she would rank it high. While this may indeed be true for this one component of the organization, other sub-units, e.g. those concerned with finance, officials' development, etc. may exhibit little or no standardized procedures.

Consequently a matrix type form was developed with the three analytical categories of organization structure listed down the ordinate and eleven different oranizational systems (e.g. communications, planning, training, decision-making, etc.) listed down the abscissa (see appendix A for list of all systems). The three analytical categories of organization structure and the eleven organizational systems produced a matrix with thirty-three cells. Questions were then generated to obtain information about each of the thirty-three cell areas e.g. how differentiated was the organization's communication systems, how formalized was the decision making system, to what extent was the financial system centralized/decentralized (see Appendix A). It was felt that this type of system allowed the research to capture intra-organizational structural differences as well differences between organizations.

In addition to the data generated through the procedure outlined above data about the structural arrangements of the organization were also obtained from organizational documents. For example, organizational specialization was determined, in part, by examining documents (minutes, annual reports, executive summaries, etc.) and recording the number of executive positions and working committees. These data were used to supplement and increase that generated through the interviews.

As part of the interview concerning the structural aspects of the organization, questions were also asked about three aspects of the organizational context. These aspects were the organizational environment, organizational technology, and the resources available to the organization. Information was gathered concerning primary sources of organizational resources, influential external organizations, impressions of the sophistication of organizational technologies e.g., sport technology and administrative technology.

As well as data on the structural arrangements of the organization it was also necessary to generate data on the major values and beliefs (or interpretive schemes) that underly these arrangements. In order to determine the major values and beliefs that pertain to the roles and functions of voluntary sport organizations an extensive review of documents was undertaken. Materials reviewed included both federal and provincial government documents, documents self-generated by the sport organizations themselves and academic and quasi-academic writings on voluntary sport organizations. From these documents a large number of potential value areas were obtained. These were then consolidated, and based on their frequency of occurrence and perceived importance seven value areas were generated (see Appendix B). The seven value areas were then submitted to a number of individuals knowledgeable about voluntary sport organizations. Each individual was asked to indicate on a five point Likert scale the extent to which he or she agreed or disagreed that these were areas where values and beliefs had changed over the time period of the study. Based upon the responses received one value area was removed. This value area concerned the changing attitudes of sport personnel (see appendix B, #5). The item total coefficient score for the questions comprising this area was below .550.

For each of the six remaining areas statements were generated (approximately 6-8 statements per area) which were felt to reflect the major value areas. These statements were then distributed to individuals considered experienced and knowledgeable in the administration of amateur sport. Again, through the use of an item total correlation coefficient these value statements were tested for reliability. As a result a series of statements (four about each value area) with Likert scale responses were developed to determine the major changes in values and beliefs that have occurred in provincial voluntary sport over the past fifteen or twenty years. A value statement was utilized in the final questionnaire only if it received an item total coefficient greater than .550 which indicated significance at the .05 level. This set of value questions (see appendix C) was administered along with the interview schedule.

V Selection of Time Periods for Analysis

The final methodological concern to be dealt with was that of selecting the appropriate periods for analysis. Miller and Friesen (1980a) have noted that brief periods between analysis will reveal only small changes. At the same time, long periods between analysis may cause changes to be missed. Thirdly, a standard period of time between analysis ignores the fact that the speed of change varies from organization to organization. As a means of overcoming these problems associated with selecting the correct period of analysis, Miller and Friesen (1980a), when rating organizations, began and ended a period of change just before or just after what they described as "decision events". It was decided that the eight types of decision events outlined by Miller and Friesen represented a valid basis for identifying transition periods. However, because the organizations under consideration operate somewhat differently than the organizations studied by Miller and Friesen the decision events were adjusted in order to make them more relevant to sport organizations (see appendix D). The decision events chosen give specific attention to transitions resulting from changes in; the organizational environment; in the professional personnel working in the voluntary sport organization; in the structure of the organization; in the decision making systems, and so on, as indications show these are the main precursors of change for these types of groups. The sample of four provincial sport organizations, each displayed five transition periods.

VI Data Collection

One key informant was selected from each transition period and they were administered the interview schedule and value questionnaire. Key informants were identified by examining organizational documents, conducting informal interviews, all with the intention of finding out which individuals (past and present) had played important roles in the operation of the organizations in question. Key informants were individuals who on the basis of present or previous positions held (i.e., past presidents, presidents, members of executives, executive directors, technical directors, etc.) were considered most likely to be knowledgeable about a broad range of organizational activities.

II Organizational Interpretive Schemes

A. Conceptualization

The conceptual basis for the identification of distinct organizational paradigms among provincial sport organizations (PSOs) was drawn from the proposition that paradigms or "design types" can be delineated according to underlying values, beliefs, and the associated structural arrangements (Ranson et al., 1980). Therefore it was necessary to try to empirically identify the values and beliefs underlying the organizational arrangements of PSOs. The first task involved searching organizational documents to gain a preliminary indication of which values and beliefs (past and present) have constituted the interpretive schemes of PSOs, and which may be used as indicators of distinct paradigms.

A prominent theme in the literature dealing with amateur sport is that its organization and administration have in recent years become increasingly rationalized. This rationalization is seen as the prime transformational force in moving amateur sport in Canada from the era of "kitchen table administration" toward today's more professional "corporate style" of administration (cf. Kidd, 1980; Frisby, 1982; Slack, 1985; and Macintosh et al., 1986). It was a search for ways to identify the values and beliefs (interpretive schemes) that underpin these two distinct administrative types that led to the development of two paradigm types. It was hoped investigation of the incidence of these two paradigms would aid in illustrating and explaining the movement of PSOs between and within them. From here on the two paradigms will be described as; Paradigm A - the Kitchen Table Volunteer, and Paradigm B - the Corporate Professional.

Previous authors have referred to notions which resemble the concept of paradigm described here. This is illustrated by references in the literature to administrative types such as "kitchen table" and "professional corporate". However these authors delineate these types purely in structural terms, referring to the "bureaucratization" of amateur sport, and utilizing the attendant structural descriptions, i.e., increased centralization, increased specialization, increased formalization (cf. Frisby, 1982; Slack, 1985; and Macintosh et al., 1986). At the heart of the Ranson et al. (1980) construct is the notion that organizational paradigms are delineated by the interpretive schemes (values and beliefs) that underly and constitute organizational structure. It must be emphasized that within the Ranson et al. (1980) framework organizational arrangements are simply the structural manifestation of the underpinning interpretive schemes. To characterize organizational paradigms primarily by the nature of their structural arrangements would be theoretically, to put the cart before the horse.

The literature on amateur sport organizations seemed to indicate the possibility of two distinct paradigms. To reinterate these will be described as paradigm A (Kitchen table volunteer), and paradigm B (Corporate professional). It was necessary to conceptually explicate the sets of values and beliefs (interpretive schemes) seen to be associated with each paradigm. It was also necessary to specify the organizational arrangements which would be associated with each interpretive scheme. The concept of interpretive scheme will be dealt with first.

In order to further distinguish paradigm A from paradigm B, it was necessary to articulate the values and beliefs that underly each paradigm. This was not an easy task. Conceptually it was difficult to discover and isolate coherent value - belief patterns that could be said to represent the two selected types. As indicated previously in this chapter (see Data Collection) two methods were used. First, a wide variety of literature was analysed with an eye towards discerning values that related to the administration of amateur sport. This literature encompassed an array of forms from government reports to the various administrative and procedural handbooks produced by PSOs (e.g. annual reports, job descriptions, terms of reference for committees, etc.). Key individuals involved in the administration of amateur sport in Alberta (e.g. executive/technical directors, presidents/past presidents, vice-presidents, etc.) were consulted. Comment was sought on their thoughts about key issues concerning the organization of amateur sport past and present. Their comments, along with the information obtained from documents provided the material upon which the value questions were based.

The results of this process led to the formulation of six major value areas. In the interests of parsimony and theoretical consistency this number was decreased to four major value areas. The area concerning values and beliefs about the provision of programs for groups which have not traditionally had equal opportunity to participate (i.e., handicapped, certain ethnic groups, and women) was omitted. In retrospect it was decided that this value area could not be used to characterize accurately orientations wholly within one paradigm or the other. The area concerning values and beliefs about the role of government was seen as fitting more appropriately under the heading of Contextual factors. Therefore, the analysis of attitudes about the role of government was undertaken by examining responses to questions asked under the category of environment (see Appendix A, section O). The following are the resulting four major value areas.

1) Beliefs about organizational commitment to programs/activities stressing recreational participation versus programs/activities stressing elite attainment.

2) Beliefs about organizational commitment to the use of volunteer staff or paid professional staff.

3) Beliefs about organizational commitment to increased organizational complexity (specialization and standardization)

4) Beliefs about organizational commitment to the application of scientific principles and modern technology to technical and administrative aspects of amateur sport.

In responding to questions revolving about the issues articulated in these four value areas individuals would indicate their particular value orientation. These value areas provided the basis for a continuum, the two ends of which would indicate interpretive schemes associated with either paradigm A or paradigm B.

B. Operational Measures

For each of the value areas mentioned in the previous section several statements were generated to form a "values survey". The purpose of this survey was to present to selected "key informants" a series of value statements, formulated so that the responses could be situated along the continuum described in the previous paragraph. Respondents from each timeslice were asked to recall and score the values as they saw them at that particular time. A Likert type scale (five points) was used to score the responses to each value statement. Five responses were available, strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree. A score of five was given for a response that "strongly agreed" with statements supporting the values underpinning paradigm B (corporate professional). These values were as follows:

1) Commitment to an elite program focus,
2) Commitment to a preference for the use of professional over volunteer staff,
3) Commitment to greater organizational specialization and standardization,
4) Commitment to greater application of science and technology to all aspects of amateur sport.

A score of four was given for a response that "agreed" with statements supporting the values underpinning paradigm B, a score of three was given for a response that "neither agreed nor disagreed" with statements supporting the values underpinning paradigm B, and so on. Note that the preceding explanation of scoring relates to positively worded statements. Some statements in the survey were worded negatively. In this case the scoring system is reversed, i.e., a score of five would be given to a response "strongly disagreeing", a score of four would be given to a response "disagreeing" with the negatively worded statement, and so on.

To determine support for the values underpinning paradigm A (kitchen table volunteer) a score of one was given for responses supporting these values. The values underpinning paradigm A were as follows:

1) Commitment to recreational participative program focus,
2) Commitment to a preference for the use of volunteer over professional staff,
3) Commitment to less organizational specialization and standardization,
4) Commitment to less application of science and technology to all aspects of amateur sport.

A score of one was given for a response that "strongly agreed" with the values underpinning paradigm A, a score of two was given for a response that "agreed" with the values underpinning paradigm A, and so on. Note that as above the preceding explanation of scoring relates to positively worded statements. Some statements in the survey were worded negatively. In this case the scoring system is reversed, i.e., a score of one would be given to a response "strongly disagreeing" with the negatively worded statement, a score of two would be given to a response "disagreeing" with the negatively worded statement and so on. In short, the system used to score responses to the value statements indicated support for paradigm A with high scores (5), and support for paradigm B with low scores (1).

On the basis of value scores for all four value areas each organization received a total value score for each time slice. These scores were compared to the following range of scores in order to indicate which paradigm the organizations seemed to be situated in at that point in time.

16 - 39	Paradigm A (Kitchen table Volunteer)
40 - 60	Schizoid (Between paradigms)
61 - 80	Paradigm B (Corporate Professional)

The lowest total score that could be received in any single value area per timeslice was 4/20 (this represented a score of one on each of the four questions comprising that value area). The highest total score possible in any single value area per timeslice was 20/20 (this represented a score of five on each of the four questions comprising that value area. It follows that the lowest possible cumulative score for all four value areas per time slice was 16/80, and the highest possible score 80/80. These scores represented the low and high ends of the range presented above.

Note that the paradigm categories of embryonic A and embryonic B (positions indicating movement toward one paradigm or the other but not yet fully coherent paradigms) were collapsed into the more general categories of paradigm A and B. It was thought the sensitivity of the instrument for tapping organizational values precluded any further elaboration than this.

III Organizational Structure

A. Conceptualization

Contingent upon the development of a methodology which allowed identification of organizational interpretive schemes was the development of a way in which to examine the structural arrangements associated with these interpretive schemes. The notion of paradigm is predicated upon the proposition that a certain coherence will exist between interpretive schemes and their attendant structural arrangements (Greenwood and Hinings, 1986). Therefore operational measures for both interpretive schemes and structures were necessary in order to specify which interpretive schemes and structures coalesced into distinctive paradigms.

The concepts utilized in this study to determine the structural arrangements of provincial sport organizations (PSOs) were drawn from contingency theory and more specifically from the work of the Aston group (cf. Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, Macdonald, Turner, and Lupton, 1963; and Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, and Turner, 1968). Based upon the Aston framework three structural dimensions were chosen with which to determine PSO structures. The first was specialization. Specialization refers to the division of labour within the organization , the allocation of official duties and tasks among a number of positions (Pugh et al., 1968). The second dimension is termed standardization. This dimension represents an amalgamation of the Aston categories of standardization and formalization. Standardization is concerned with the regularization of organizational procedures, while formalization denotes the extent to which rules, procedures, instructions, and communications are written (Pugh et al., 1968). The third dimension was centralization/decentralization, which has to do with the locus of authority to make decisions affecting the organization (Pugh et al., 1968).

The choice of these dimensions seemed particularly appropriate in light of the literature on volunteer sport organizations. This literature notes a shift in organzational forms from ones characterized by low levels of specialization, low standardization of procedures, and simple authority structures, to forms displaying high levels of specialization and standardization and where decision making is decentralized, often in the hands of professionals (cf. Kidd, 1980; Frisby, 1982; and Slack, 1985).

To relate this in terms of the notion of paradigm suggested here it is proposed that organizational structures falling under the paradigm A type will exhibit low levels of specialization, standardization, and display simple authority structures characterized by high levels of centralization (decisions made at higher levels in the hierarchy). Organizational structures falling under the paradigm B type will exhibit high levels of specialization, standardization, and display more complex authority structures, characterized by lower levels of centralization (more decisions made at lower levels of the hierarchy).

B. Operational Measures

A measure of the degree to which the structural dimensions existed in the PSOs necessitated operationalization of these structural concepts. This was accomplished in the following way. First, a detailed set of structured questions was produced. This questionnaire included several questions under each of eleven subheadings (see appendix A). These subheadings corresponded to the particular systems of a PSO. The questions were formulated so that they could be categorized under the three primary structural dimensions of specialization, standardization, and centralization/decentralization. Information concerning specialization was obtained for eleven different organizational systems. Information concerning standardization and centralization/decentralization was obtained for nine systems. Early in the study it became apparent that giving scores on particular dimensions for some systems (e.g., Scanning) would be inappropriate as most of the sample PSOs possessed these systems only in name. This explains the numerical difference, in systems for which information was gathered, between the dimensions of specialization and the other two structural dimensions.

In addition to the eleven subheadings for which structural information was gathered, four subheadings were produced under which contextual information was generated. The headings were Resources, Technology, Organizational Characteristics, and Environment (see appendix A, sections L,M,N,O). A series of questions were asked under each of these headings in order to gain information about these contextual factors.

In order to compare between organizations a simple three point scoring system was devised. A score of one represented "little or none" of that particular dimension on that question; a score of two represented "some" of that particular dimension; and a score of three represented "a lot" of that particular dimension. In this way a total score could be arrived at for each organization on each dimension. The criteria, or basis on which the scoring system was devised, did not hinge on any absolute sense of what "more" or "less" of a particular dimension represented. Theoretically, this study was intended to expose the existence of organizational change, not to quantify precisely how much change occurred. Therefore the simple three point system was devised based upon the degree of structural difference expected between organizations, and between distinct time slices. This is to say it was a relative measure.

In order to situate a PSO in one paradigm or another on the basis of its structural dimension scores, the following categories were created.

Specialization

20 - 33 Paradigm A
34 - 46 Schizoid
47 - 60 Paradigm B

Standardization

15 - 24 Paradigm A
25 - 34 Schizoid
35 - 45 Paradigm B

Centralization/Decentralization

15 - 25 Paradigm B
26 - 35 Schizoid
36 - 45 Paradigm A

These score ranges were based upon the theoretical propositions elaborated earlier that characterized structures with low levels of specialization, standardization, and high levels of centralization (decentralized indicating low levels of centralization)as being coherent with paradigm A. Conversely structures with high levels of specialization, standardization, and low levels of centralization (decentralized) were seen as coherent with paradigm B. The difference in ranges between standardization, centralization/decentralization (15 - 45) and specialization (20 - 60) reflects the number of questions asked in order to obtain information on that particular dimension.

IV Results and Discussion

I Introduction

The findings of the study will be presented in four major sections. In the first section the scores from the values questionnaire will be presented. The grouping of the organizational interpretive schemes into paradigms will be discussed, as will the variation of interpretive schemes between timeslices and factors influencing these variations. These discussions will revolve around the answer to subproblem 1.

In section two, the structural dimension scores will be discussed. The levels of specialization, standardization, and centralization/decentralization in each of the systems outlined in the structural questionnaire will be presented for each organization over all the timeslices. Variation in scores among the structural dimensions both intra- and inter-organizationally will be examined. Reference will be made to factors influencing the variation among structural dimensions. The total structural dimension scores for each organization for each time slice will be compared to a range of scores grouping the structural dimension scores into paradigms. Discussion in this section will centre around answering subproblem 2.

In section three, the impact of environmental factors upon both interpretive schemes and organization structure will be discussed. Based upon responses to the structural questionnaire and upon documentary analysis the effect of specific factors (e.g. the provincial government) upon PSOs will be examined. These discussions will centre around answering subproblem 3.

The fourth section will consist of two parts. First a discussion of the temporal sequencing of changes in interpretive schemes and organization structure will be undertaken. The final value scores and the final structure scores will be compared and relationships between interpretive schemes and structural arrangements will be discussed in light of the Ranson et al. and Greenwood and Hinings theoretical framework. This discussion will lead to an answer to subproblem 4.

The the second part will be concerned with identifying the patterns of change that emanate from the results of the previous sections. The discussion will include a comparison of each organization's value scores and structural dimension scores in order to determine paradigm coherence. Variation over timeslices in the paradigm coherence of each PSO will be discussed in order to illustrate the patterns of change. This section will revolve around answering subproblem 5.

II PSO Interpretive Schemes - The Value Questionnaire Results

The reference to terms such as "value questionnaire scores", "value scores", and "value score totals" will pertain to table #2 in appendix E. In this table the value scores of all organizations sampled are presented by "value area" and by "timeslice".

A. General Trends

A cursory scan of table #2 illustrates that overall the total value scores of all four PSOs show little variance between timeslices. In three out of four PSOs the total value score for timeslice 1 is not substantially different from that of timeslice 5. The exception is the AVA, whose value scores oscillate quite substantially during the earlier timeslices (1 - 3). These results suggest that for the majority of the sample the organizational interpretive schemes (as defined by the selected value areas for which questions were asked) have remained relatively stable through out the period of this study.

A closer examination of the total value scores shows that two out of the four PSOs (CFSA-AS and CASA-AS) exhibit scores above sixty across all five timeslices. This suggests that the organizational interpretive schemes consist of values representing a paradigm B (Corporate Professional) orientation. The other two PSOs (ASA and AVA) exhibit total value scores falling in the forty to sixty range, with most scores being in high fifties. This suggests that their organizational interpretive schemes consist of values representing a Schizoid paradigm orientation, i.e., values that fully support neither paradigm A nor B. However, the scores are in the high end of the Schizoid range which suggests that there is more support for values representing a paradigm B orientation.

From these results the general observation can be made that the interpretive schemes of all four PSOs consist of values and beliefs which generally reflect a paradigm B orientation. Moreover these interpretive schemes have been relatively stable through out the period of this study. This suggests that even during the early timeslices (i.e., 1969 until the mid '70s) when organizational structures were relatively undeveloped the administrators and managers held values and beliefs supporting a paradigm B orientation.

The results of the values questionnaire being as they are an explanation of why this is so provides rather more questions than answers. Support for values representing a paradigm B orientation may be explained by reference to factors of both a general and a specific nature. Interpretive schemes supporting a paradigm B orientation may be explained by refering to the impact of more expansive societal values. What Weber refered to as the "rationalization" of modern life must certainly extend into the activities of sport and into the activities of PSOs. It is feasible to suggest that the voluntary sport organizations studied in this research have been influenced by the pursuit of rationality and consequently exhibit increasingly higher levels of bureaucratization. Contemporary acceptance of the "methods of science"; of "organizational efficiency"; of the supposed "superiority of professional staff" coupled with ideological acceptance of the "pursuit of excellence" ethos as it is interpreted by major deliverers of amateur sport (including government), can be observed in the values of those who structure and manage the affairs of voluntary sport organizations. The work of other writers has produced similar findings to this study, although primarily they were concerned with the role of external agencies (mostly government) in promoting these values (cf. Kidd, 1980; Macintosh and Franks 1982; and Franks and Macintosh 1983) in sport organizations.

Support for values representing a paradigm B orientation may also be explained by reference to more immediate environmental factors. The parent national bodies of the PSOs often act as ideological conduits, passing on organizational values. Such values include beliefs about how to organize, the proper program focus, the desireability of professional staff, and so on. These values are imitated by the PSOs, and often incorporated into their formal goal statements. This may take the form of constitutional obligations as a subunit of the national sport organization (NSO). For example, rules laid down at the national level about how to structure competitions, how to organize clubs, how to structure their administrative systems, etc, are required to be adopted by the PSOs. Support is lent to this explanation by the notion of "core institutions" (Schon, 1971). Core values are developed and transmitted by individuals within institutions - such as government or the parent sport body - and these values may be transmitted to other organizations such as the PSO.

There is also an increasingly proactive governmental (both provincial and federal) role being played in the transmission of values to volunteer sport organizations. Government bureaucracies have long been strongholds of values supporting "efficient, rational" management. These government bureaucracies which provide the majority of funding to national and provincial sport organizations now often make funding contingent upon the submission of organizational profiles or reports which must contain detailed plans concerning the intended use of funds. In addition to providing for some measure of accountability these imposed measures also transmit values which modify the interpretive schemes of the organizations involved. Government agencies tend to provide funding based on guidelines such as those outlined in Sport Canada's "Best Ever" and "Quadrennial Planning" programs. These guidelines which encourage an elite competitive focus, professionalization of staff, and increased organizational complexity (specialization and standardization), may contribute to the formation of values that support a paradigm B orientation. Many provincial governments (among which Alberta is foremost) have instituted programs similar in nature, though smaller in scale, which are based upon the federal programs.

Reference to Slack and Hinings (1986) gives the notion of value transmission from government to amateur sport organizations further support. They describe the quadrennial planning system of Sport Canada as both a part of the process of rationalization which amateur sport is undergoing, and an activity which "gives it further thrust". Rational planning is both a consequence of rationalization and a cause of its further development.

B. Specific Differences

It has been noted that based on total value scores two organizations, the CFSA-AS and CASA-AS, are situated in the paradigm B category. Officially all four organizations are sub-units of their parent National Sport Organizations, however, in practical terms the CFSA-AS and CASA-AS are both linked much more closely to their corresponding NSOs. Evidence of this at a most cursory level is their designations of "AS"(Alberta Section). As will be noted in the forthcoming discussion of structure these organizations tend to have more formal links with their national associations. The national bodies have been under increasing pressure to rationalize (cf. Quadrennial Planning Program: National Sport Organization High Performance Review Guide, June, 1984). Measures taken by the NSOs to promote rational planning and managerial efficiency are often displaced down to the level of the provincial organizations. This would tend to provide a convenient and focussed path for the transmission of organizational values, including those which would support a paradigm B orientation.

Upon examination of the value scores for each distinct area two value areas exhibit consistently higher scores across all five time slices. These value areas are "use of professional staff versus volunteer staff" and "levels of standardization". Looking first of all at the value area of professional/volunteer staff, the results indicate high scores for all organizations across all time slices. There is one score of 14/20 in timeslice #1 (ASA) and one score of 15/20 in timeslice #4 (AVA). The rest of the scores are between 16 - 20/20, thus showing there is strong support for values indicating a preference for the use of professional staff over volunteer staff.

Second, taking the value area of "levels of standardization", the results indicate high scores for three organizations, across all timeslices. The exception is the AVA. Among the other three PSOs there is one score of 11/20 in timeslice #2 (ASA). The rest of the value scores range between 15 - 19/20. There is strong support for values indicating a preference for higher levels of standardization (the development of rules, procedures, and written guidelines for performing tasks).

The results of this study which show strong values supporting increased professionalization and standardization, concur in this respect with much of the organizational theory literature on professionalization. Studies such as that of Hall (1968) find strong correlations between professionalization and standardization of organizational processes. With the advent of increased specialization (i.e., more internal variety) via the introduction of new specialized roles, more processes and procedures are needed to coordinate the interaction between these roles and the rest of the organization. It is the specialists or professionals who are responsible for introducing and policing the introduction of rules and procedures to which others must work.

The findings of this study which show strong support for values and beliefs reinforcing a Paradigm B orientation can be related to what Ranson et al. (1980) call the "institutionalization of ideas". They liken this notion to that proposed by Selznick (1949) where an organization is pressured to incorporate "morally sustaining ideas" from its institutional environment (in this case often from their national body or from government), ideas which give support to its processes and structures. Meyer and Rowan (1977) suggest that it is these type of institutional rules and "rationalized myths" that propel organizational decision makers to adopt certain policies, procedures, and occupational specialists. As an example, in the case of PSOs they may gave been "pressured" to employ certain types of professional staff or promote certain type of programs because this was seen as "the right thing to do". The findings of this study are also supported by Hinings and Greenwood (1986) who suggest that institutionally, a set of cultural values and normative demands both proscribe and prescribe parameters of organizational operation. They relate this to their notion of "design type" (similar to paradigm) whereby the structural elements and organizational processes making up the design type are strongly associated to underlying interpretive schemes forming an institutionally derived normative order (Hinings and Greenwood, 1986).

The findings of this study which show that for PSOs specific values are accompanied by particular sets of structures and that structures are adapted to fit these values, supports the previously cited literature on institutionalization.

III PSO Structures - Structure Questionnaire Results

References made in this section to terms such as "structural dimension scores", "dimension scores", and "total dimension scores" will pertain to table #3a-d in appendix E which presents the scores tabulated from the structural questionnaires. Scores on all three dimensions were obtained for specified organizational systems for all four PSOs across all five timeslices.

Initial examination of table #3 indicates two general trends. First, scores on the dimensions of specialization and standardization suggest that in all four PSOs there has been a substantial and steady increase in levels of specialization and standardization over the period of the study. Although there are inter-organizational differences between initial (timeslice #1) levels of specialization and standardization, each organization displays a steady increase in scores on these dimensions. Scores on the dimensions of specialization and standardization in the final timeslice (timeslice #5) are uniformly high. Second, scores on the dimension of centralization/decentralization demonstrate little change over the period of the study. Two organizations (ASA and CFSA-AS) display a slight decrease in levels of centralization while the other two PSOs (AVA and CASA-AS) display little or no change in scores on this dimension.

A. Similarities Across Organizations

An examination of the specialization and standardization scores of all four PSOs across the five timeslices show that with one exception (CASA-AS on the dimension of specialization) all organizations moved from levels of specialization and standardization associated with paradigm A, to levels of specialization and standardization associated with paradigm B. On the dimension of centralization/decentralization all four PSOs displayed no substantial change in the level of this dimension, from timeslice #1 to #5. Although two organizations (ASA and CFSA-AS) showed slight decreases, their centralization/decentralization scores along with the rest of the sample, fell into the schizoid category.

To this point the results as presented on table #3 show levels of specialization and standardization (for all four PSOs) that suggest a structural reorientation towards a paradigm B orientation. The scores on centralization/decentralization, however, suggest a structural orientation which is schizoid. Although fitting completely neither into paradigm A or B, scores are skewed toward a paradigm B orientation. The general indication given by the structural dimension scores is that the four PSOs are in a stage of transition, moving strongly toward a structural orientation coherent with paradigm B. These findings support two propositions made by Greenwood and Hinings concerning structural orientations.

First, the findings provide empirical support for the notion of "organizational coherence". Greenwood and Hinings (1986) propose that organizational designs or paradigms display a coherence or patterning of component elements based upon the values and beliefs of an underlying interpretive scheme. The PSOs in question exhibit values and beliefs which comprise an interpretive scheme supporting paradigm B, and also display structures which are moving toward coherence with that value orientation. However, Greenwood and Hinings (1986) also suggest there are two theoretical reasons why this paradigm coherence arises; the argument from task accomplishment, and the argument from political control. At this point inferences made from the present study as to which are appropriate can only be tentative. Given the nature of the organizational environment within which the PSOs exist, it may be argued that their paradigm coherence has arisen for both reasons. External agents (government) have defined, in value terms, an area of prescribed organizational activity (high performance sport), and the PSOs are beginning to utilize what is deemed the most efficient, rational, institutionally accepted means (rational, corporate style manangement) of pursuing those activities.

Second, the findings of this study support the notion proposed by Greenwood and Hinings that "intra-paradigmatic change" is more common than "inter-paradigmatic" change. Among the PSOs the most common pattern of change was that of structural arrangements moving (at varying rates) towards structural coherence with a paradigm B orientation. The interesting question which this study cannot answer is when did these PSOs develop interpretive schemes of a paradigm B orientation? The AVA is the only case which initially showed an interpretive scheme with a near paradigm A orientation and subsequently displayed anything close to "inter-paradigmatic" change. The remainder of the sample organizations displayed interpretive schemes with paradigm B orientations through all time periods.

B. Differences Over Time Between Organizations

In addition to the general trends indicated by total dimension scores across all four PSOs there were some interesting differences between organizations. It was noted previously how all organizations showed steady increases in levels of specialization and standardization. Two PSOs (CFSA-AS and CASA-AS) displayed higher initial scores on these two dimensions than the remaining two PSOs (ASA and AVA). Both the CFSA-AS and CASA-AS displayed dimension scores indicating a schizoid or near schizoid structural orientation in timeslice #1. The ASA and AVA on the other hand displayed scores on specialization and standardization in timeslice #1 indicating a paradigm A structural orientation. Speculation about why these differences exist will be reserved for more complete discussion in section IV under Contextual Factors. Generally scores on the dimension of centralization/decentralization showed the least change. The AVA and CASA-AS displayed very little variation in levels of centralization/decentralization over the period of analysis. Their scores remained within the schizoid category over all five timeslices. The ASA and CFSA-AS which also displayed scores within the schizoid category over all five timeslices, did show a weak trend towards decentralization (low levels of centralization) indicating movement towards a paradigm B orientation.

The equivocal nature of this study's findings on the variable of centralization/decentralization is reflected in the literature. The variable of centralization has been found to be related to a number of other organizational elements (cf. Hall, 1982) but not in a consistent manner. This notwithstanding the literature on centralization does provide insights that give some meaning to the results obtained in this study.

The results obtained may be explained in terms of the tension between the volunteer and the professional in voluntary sport organizations. Hall (1982) points out the important need for membership participation in the decision making process within voluntary organizations, as this is a form of power determination that tends to assure continued participation. This dynamic would explain the failure of the PSOs to decentralize in the face of the introduction of professional staff. Michels (1949) notes the tendency of voluntary organizations towards oligarchy, in that the group in power (volunteers) want to stay there and will endeavor to ensure its continuation in office. This describes the situation in voluntary sport organizations very well, and may explain the resistance towards decentralization. Hall (1982) also notes the work of Raphael (1967) concerning the study of labour unions. She noted that dispersed voluntary organizations (those semiautonomous from centralized control - which many PSOs are) tend towards oligarchy since a managerial clique can be formed containing elected leaders and selected members who perform many of the administrative functions (Raphael, 1967).

Finally, two other factors, those of competitiveness and size are presented as helping to explain levels of centralization. In regard to competition, Negandhi and Reimann (1972) suggest that competitive market conditions make decentralization more important for organizational success than do less competitive situations. The PSOs in the present study have no competition, in fact they are often monopolistic. Consequently they are under little pressure to decentralize. In regard to size Hall, (1982) suggests that increasing size is accompanied by increased decentralization, especially if there is an influx of professional personnel - while in smaller organizations personnel report directly to the top, a more centralized situation. PSOs are relatively small organizations and therefore reporting is directly to the top, i.e., a centralized situation.

C. Differences Over Time Among Systems

Apart from the general organizational trends indicated, the dimension scores for individual systems showed some interesting structural variation when examined across organizational timeslices. The system of communication (which incorporated questions about meetings, committees, and other communication processes) provides a case in point. During the initial timeslices an organization such as the ASA (timeslice #1) displayed very low levels of specialization and standardization, and high levels of centralization, a structural orientation strongly entrenched in paradigm A. The AVA followed much the same pattern. A further examination of this system, however, shows that the CFSA-AS and CASA-AS exhibit different patterns. During the initial timeslice these two organizations displayed relatively high levels of specialization, medium levels of standardization, and medium to high levels of centralization.

By following the dimension scores on communication through to timeslice #5 it can be seen that for the CFSA-AS and CASA-AS the relatively high levels of specialization and standardization increase somewhat, while levels of centralization/decentralization remain unchanged. The resulting pattern is a strengthing of an already coherent paradigm B structural orientation. For the AVA and ASA, the pattern is somewhat different. From initially low levels of specialization and standardization there is movement to high levels. Centralization/decentralization levels remain unchanged. The resulting trend can be described as a structural shift away from a paradigm A orientation towards a paradigm B orientation. The patterns illustrated here suggest that PSOs evolve structurally at different rates and that individual systems can simultaneously exhibit high levels of one dimension and low levels of another.

The dimension scores indicate another interesting difference. Take the situation of the CFSA-AS for example. Overall this organization displayed steadily increasing levels of specialization and standardization. However, if one compares the systems of Scanning, Evaluation, and Marketing/Promotion with the systems of Human Resource development, Planning, and Communication, one can see that the former systems display little or no change over time, while the latter areas display steadily increasing specialization and standardization. This suggests that rather than experiencing general increases/decreases in structural dimensions across all systems in the organization simultaneously, PSOs may experience differential increases/decreases in levels of specialization, standardization, and centralization/decentralization according to individual systems. Interestingly this runs counter to the propositions of some writers who suggest a measure of continuity and simultaneity concerning changes among organizational variables.

For instance, Miller and Friesen (1980a) suggest that because of the interdependencies among variables of organization and strategy making, continuous changes in some variables will cause continuous changes in others. To them simultaneous change means that variables change in the same direction during the period of analysis. In the present study the dimension of centralization/decentralization illustrated little or no change relative to the other structural dimensions over the whole period of the study. This also runs counter, in one respect, to the Greenwood and Hinings framework, in that the PSOs are not exhibiting coherence to paradigm B on all of the structural dimensions.

Further illustration of the lack of complete structural coherence stems from an examination of the levels of specialization and standardization within the system of Human Resource Development. The pattern to be discussed does not show up on table #3 because it concerns the sub-scales (questions) which composed this system. These sub-scales (see appendix A, section H) included questions on the levels of specialization and standardization of the following areas; athlete development, coaches development, officials development, and administrators development. A general trend emerged across all four organizations. Without exception the sub-scale of officials development exhibited the highest initial levels of specialization, standardization, and the lowest level of centralization. Administrator development showed the reverse situation, exhibiting initially the lowest levels of specialization and standardization along with the highest level of centralization. The sub-scales of athlete and coaches development displayed the same pattern as officials development except that their initial levels of specialization and standardization were lower. Three of the four sub-scales (officials, athletes, and coaches development) showed steadily increasing levels of specialization and standardization, while levels of centralization declined slightly but showed less pattern than the changes exhibited by the scores on the other two dimensions. The sub-scale of administrator development displayed little change from the initial levels on all three dimensions.

These results show a much greater emphasis on structural change in the technical areas (officials, coaches, and athletes) of human resource development than in the administrative areas. This is reflected by Kimberly and Quinn (1984) when they suggest that the behavioral side of organizational change is traditionally undermanaged compared to the technical side. They attribute this to the belief that technical issues are associated with rational, quantifiable, and technical solutions, while behavioral issues are believed to be less concrete, more ephemeral, and less subject to black and white solutions (Kimberly and Quinn, 1984). This leads to the belief that the behavioral side of managing change is based wholly on subjectivity, intuition, and common sense. There is little systematic thought given as to how the behavioral aspect of managing organizational can be integrated with the technical aspect. If one relates this to the situation of voluntary sport organizations the parallel is readily apparent with the greater emphasis on the technical side of sport and the much less emphasis on the behavioral or administrative aspects of organizational development.

D. Summary

The salient patterns brought to light by the results presented in Tables #3a-d can be summarized as follows.

i) General Trends

The scores on the dimensions of specialization and standardization suggest that all four PSOs have experienced steady increases in levels of these two dimensions over the time of the study. Scores on the dimension of centralization show a different trend. Starting from high levels the ASA and CFSA-AS display a slight decrease in levels of centralization over the period of analysis. The AVA and CASA-AS exhibit little or no change on this dimension having also displayed initial high levels.

ii) Similarities across Organizations

Scores on the structural dimensions indicate that all four PSOs display structural orientations placing them more or less within paradigm B - the corporate professional type. The results when examined across the timeslices reinforce the notion that to a greater or lesser degree all four PSOs seem to be moving toward a condition of increasing structural coherence, and consolidation within paradigm B.

iii) Differences across Timeslices between and within PSOs

In timeslice #1, the start of the study, the CFSA-AS and CASA-AS displayed substantially higher scores on the dimensions of specialization and standardization than did the ASA and AVAs as a result, the CFSA-AS and CASA-AS showed relatively less structural change. They started, in structural terms, from a Schizoid orientation (near paradigm B) and moved over the course of the study to a more coherent paradigm B state. The ASA and AVA displayed relatively more structural change. They started from a near paradigm A state and shifted dramatically over the course of the study to a near coherent paradigm B state.

Examination of the dimension scores within individual systems and comparison of these scores with other systems both within the organization and within the remaining sample organizations suggests the following trends. PSOs, rather than simultaneously experiencing increases/decreases in levels of the three structural dimensions across all systems may experience differential increases/decreases in levels of these dimensions according to individual systems and their particular relationship with the organization as a whole.

IV Contextual Factors - Questionnaire Results

The contextual dimensions of a PSO characterize the whole organization and are those aspects which influence its structure. Dimensions of context traditionally examined have been those of size, resources, technology, and the organizational environment. The specific empirical focus of this research was an examination of the organizational structure, and of the values and beliefs comprising the members' interpretive schemes. From the results obtained proposals about the paradigm orientation of the PSOs would be presented. It was beyond the empirical scope of this study to gather detailed data about the various contextual dimensions and present them in a structured form. Yet, the contextual dimensions that affect the PSOs had to be taken into account in some way. This was done by asking some general questions about the impact of a few significant contextual dimensions (see Appendix A, sections M, N, O). It was the responses to section O - Environment, that elicited the most interesting and informative responses, therefore it is with those results which this section will deal.

The questions asked concerning environment related primarily to external organizations and individuals that may impact on the PSO. From the responses given by key informants in all four PSOs three elements were consistently raised. Those elements were; the provincial government, the parent national sport organizations, and important or significant organizational members, each of these will be discussed in turn.

A. Provincial Government

Many of the individuals interviewed talked at length about their primary organization's financial dependence upon the provincial government (Alberta Recreation and Parks) and its agents (Alberta Sport Council, Recreation Parks and Wildlife Foundation, etc.). This is not surprising since provincial amateur sport organizations receive the majority of their funding from the provincial coffers. This funding began in a systematic way in the middle seventies and with the advent of the Alberta Sport Council in 1984, the funds available to PSOs increased dramatically. This dependence on provincial government funding has implications for PSOs. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) highlight the implications involved when organizations engage in exchanges and transactions with other groups or organizations. These exchanges may involve resources of a varied nature, monetary, physical, information, or social legitimacy. The environment must be relied on to provide crucial resources, for few organizations are self-sufficient (PSOs are especially dependent on the provincial government for financial support). In exchange for the provision of these resources external groups or agencies often demand certain actions or behaviors of the organization (in the case of PSOs it is financial accountability and the provision of written plans). Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) state that it this dependence by the organization on the environment that makes the external constraint and control of organizational behavior both possible and almost inevitable.

In sport funding is conditional and in order to receive their grants, PSOs are required to submit an organizational profile and three year plan. On one hand this external pressure to rationalize; i.e., develop formal planning systems, develop distinct program areas that correspond to the evaluative categories of Recreation and Parks, develop accounting procedures, hire professional staff, etc., has had some effect in speeding up the inculcation of a values orientation corresponding to that of paradigm B - the corporate professional type. On the other hand, the influx of funding has made possible a proliferation of PSO initiated programs and activities, that may not have been possible otherwise.

The result of this rapid growth in activities has been an increase in organizational specialization, as new sub-units (committees, task-forces, etc.) are created to administer these activities. All of this has strained the ability of the volunteers to manage the organization. Professional paid staff are rapidly appearing in PSOs, their task being to operate and manage the organization in a more rational and efficient manner. It appears that with increasing specialization, the use of professional staff also increases. More written procedures and control systems are being instituted and utilized.

Adding to the external pressure upon PSOs to rationalize is the recent creation of the Alberta Sport Council. Created in April of 1984 this Crown Corporation was set up to aid the development of high performance sport in Alberta by working closely with the PSOs. The Sport Council offers funding in a number of areas concerning high performance sport; Technical Development, Games and Competitions, Marketing, and a special Olympic Game Plan program. Commensurate with the program possibilities this funding makes possible are the systems of control and accountability which accompany such funding. These examples are indicative of the increasing rationalization of PSOs in Alberta, and the results presented in table #3 support this trend.

It was noted earlier that even with the advent of professionalization in the PSOs, there has not been the decentralization that often accompanies the addition of professional staff (cf. Hall, 1968). Some explanations from the literature were offered as to why this was so. An environmental factor that may also explain this, is what has been termed public accountability. Pugh et al., (1969) noted that nationalized companies tended to be more centralized, and that public accountability tended to raise the level of bureaucratic documentation. Given the strong association/dependence of the PSOs on the provincial government, a publicly accountable institution, this factor may contribute to the relatively high levels of centralization as presented in table #3.

B. Parent National Organizations

Another environmental factor mentioned extensively during the interviews was the effect of parent national sport organizations (NSOs) upon the corresponding PSOs. The fact that the PSOs were enmeshed in larger coordinating organizations seemed to affect levels of specialization and standardization. This was especially true for the CFSA-AS and CASA-AS. The parent organizations required the provincial "sections" to have additional procedures and documents than would result from the scale of the section alone. These additional organizational components are necessary in order for the section to synchronize with the parent body for the purpose of providing consistency in application of the NSO's programs and systems i.e., judging standards, competition formats, rule interpretation, etc.).

Hall (1982) refers to several aspects of interorganizational relationships which may affect the interaction between organizations. In his study of organizations concerned with problem youths (1982), he found that the presence of a formal agreement between organizations was related to the frequency and importance of interactions. A situation described as "mandatedness" was found to have an impact on whether an organization received financial support. Mandatedness refers to the extent to which relationships are governed by laws or regulations (Hall, 1982). In these kind of interactional circumstances the organization or agency which has more input into the content of the agreement or mandate is in a position to influence the organization with which it is interacting. Referring to the PSOs that are part of this study, all have what could be described as some form of formal agreement with their NSO. However for some of them (CFSA-AS and CASA-AS) the agreements were more formalized and comprehensive, which led to increased levels of standardization and specialization.

The presence of a superordinate organization in the form of the parent NSO may also explain the high levels of centralization exhibited by the PSOs even into the later timeslices. Since the PSO is in some ways a subsidiary of the NSO, some decisions require authorization therefore reducing the autonomy of the PSO. Many decisions faced by both the CFSA-AS and CASA-AS were made entirely on the basis of the "NSO guidelines". Examples of such guidelines consist of required constitutional formats for new clubs (CFSA-AS), and mandatory content for the evaluations by which athletes and officials progress through the levels of the sport.

Finally, Hinings and Greenwood (1986) provide a rationale for explaining the impact of external agencies on a particular organization. They point out how within organizational sectors certain organizations are perceived as more efficient, more innovative and more authorative than others - they are "market leaders" (Hinings and Greenwood, 1986). The practices and methods used by these market leaders are taken up by other organizations in the sector. It is part of a process of giving credence and legitimacy to a particular set of organizational practices (Hinings and Greenwood, 1986). It may be suggested that a similar "diffusion of ideas" (Hinings and Greenwood, 1986) occurs between NSOs and PSOs. In many ways the NSOs are seen as the innovators and practices (both technical and administrative) developed at the NSO level are taken up by the provincial organizations.

C. Significant Organizational Members

The last contextual factor to be discussed here will be that of significant organizational members, those individuals who by their actions are able to have substantial impact on the structure of the organization. This factor is akin to Weber's "Charismatic Leader" (Weber, 1968) and has been discussed in relation to the development of an amateur sport organization (cf. Slack, 1983).

This factor played a role in the structural development of two out of four PSOs, the AVA and ASA. In both cases the individuals played a major part during timeslice #3, a period during which the PSOs in question underwent substantial increases in levels of specialization and standardization (ASA 27-39/60 and 17-28/45 respectively; AVA 31-43/60 and 17-28/45 respectively). It is interesting to note that on the dimension of specialization, the AVA and ASA experienced a substantial increase between timeslice #2 and #3. After timeslice #3 the AVA and ASA increased on this dimension at a much slower rate, similar to that of the CFSA-AS and CASA-AS.

The primary impact upon the ASA as a result of their "charismatic leader" was the amalgamation in 1975 of a number of separate soccer governing bodies in the province. Under this leader these separate bodies became the ASA. Also the planning system introduced by this individual was the forerunner of the system used by the ASA today.

In the period 1978 - 80, the AVA's "Charismatic leader" was responsible for establishing what was to become one of the AVA's primary athlete and coaching development programs. This individual originally developed the Jasper Volleyball Camp under the auspices of an outside agency. However in 1978 he became the president of the AVA and the Jasper Volleyball Camp was brought under the jurisdiction of the AVA. This individual was also a primary force behind the regionalization of the AVA (division into regional zones) and the development of the first three year planning process used by the AVA. It seems that during a time of considerable structural instability and development a charismatic individual was able to exercise considerable influence and control over the activities of the AVA.

It is interesting to note that "Charismatic leaders" seemed able to play a more substantive role in PSOs that were less structurally developed and less closely tied to parent NSOs. Hall (1982) refers to organizational size and the abilities of leaders to "turn organizations around". He observes that larger organizations are likely to be more complex and formalized, and more resistant to change. Therefore it is unlikely that an individual leader would be able to "turn the organization around" in a short period of time (Hall, 1982). Conversely, smaller organizations which tend to be less complex and formalized (such as the ASA and AVA) would be more susceptible to significant change brought about by an individual leader.

V. Values and Structures - The Temporal Sequencing of Change

It is important to highlight the excursive nature of this study and to emphasize the need to view any causal explanation given here in those terms. The nature of this study is preliminary and exploratory. This is not to discount the significance of these results for they provide a new angle from which to view the organization of amateur sport. It is hoped that the questions raised by the results of this study will provide general direction for the application of more rigorous and detailed methods of enquiry.

The sequences and patterns of change suggested by the results of this study will be best explained in the context of a recounting of the Greenwood and Hinings (1986) framework. As set out earlier Greenwood and Hinings propose that "design types" or paradigms as they are called here can be delineated according to underlying values and beliefs or interpretive schemes which give order and coherence to structural attributes. Greenwood and Hinings suggest there are reasons for expecting coherence between these components. Organizational paradigms tend toward coherence because they facilitate task accomplishment and promote stabilization of the organization's system of political control (Greenwood and Hinings, 1986). This framework provides the basis for a classification according to paradigm types. These types are identified by the isolation of sets of values and beliefs which are coupled with associated patterns of organizational structures. It was on the basis of this notion that that the paradigm types utilized for this study were developed (value - structure sets corresponding to paradigms A and B).

The discussion concerning the transition of the PSOs between paradigm types will revolve around the following general points:

i) The stable nature of the interpretive schemes of all four PSOs throughout the time period of the study.

ii) The structural change exhibited by all four PSOs over the time period of the study.

iii) The impact of contextual factors (primarily environmental) upon the preceding patterns.

iv) A preliminary indication of the "organizational tracks" followed by the PSOs over the time of the study.

The results presented in table #2 suggest that over the course of this study the interpretive schemes of all four PSOs remained relatively stable and showed a paradigm B orientation. The results presented in Tables #3a-d show structural arrangements that are initially decoupled from the interpretive schemes but which over time change until in the latter timeslices a state of structural coherence with organizational interpretive schemes is reached. This overall pattern supports the notion that organizations tend to develop a momentum that leads to coherence between interpretive schemes and structure. It is important to also understand the enabling and constraining influence of the organizational context and the implications this has on paradigm coherence.

The enabling and constraining nature of environmental contingencies may explain the initial discrepancies between the AVA and ASA on one hand and the CFSA-AS and CASA-AS on the other, in regard to certain structural dimensions. During the early stages of the study (timeslice #2) the CFSA-AS and CASA-AS displayed higher levels of specialization and standardization (the exception being the CFSA-AS on standardization). This increased structural complexity would seem to facilitate more effective task management given the nature of their environment - both were subsidiaries, much more closely connected to their national counterparts than either of the AVA or ASA. These connections would seem to have aided the development of internal organizational systems, as such systems, were based upon ones already established and utilized at the national level. Such systems existed at the national level due to the growing interest of the federal government in amateur sport and the program initiatives stemming from this interest. PSO access to the "system knowledge and resources" of the NSO could be described in one sense as "enabling". In this case environmental contingencies coincided with the focus of the interpretive schemes, with the result of movement towards structural coherence with paradigm B.

The AVA and ASA shared the same interpretive schemes as the CFSA-AS and CASA-AS. They varied from these organizations initially in not possessing the same degree of specialization and standardization. Neither the AVA nor ASA shared the same links with their NSOs as did the other two. It required the conjunction of special circumstances to initiate structural change. Circumstances such as the rise of charismatic individuals possessing abilities to influence structures and the external involvement of an agency such as the provincial government with its injection of financial resources and administrative values both served to bring about structural change. These condition coupled with the existence of a value orientation already commensurate with paradigm B served to move these PSOs toward structural coherence with paradigm B.

Despite the general trend towards structural coherence associated with paradigm B there were some pertinent structural differences between and within the PSOs. It was noted earlier how specific systems within an organization could evolve structurally at different rates. Reference was then made to systems such as athlete and officials development becoming specialized and standardized earlier than other systems such as administrator development. Explanation of these patterns requires discussion of the internal dynamics of PSOs.

PSOs consist of individuals who hold certain beliefs about what the organization is all about. A belief strongly communicated by the key informants interviewed was that PSOs are about athletes and competition, i.e., developing athletes and organizing competitions. Most of the people with power over decision making in the PSOs seem to reflect these views by virtue of focussing their effort into these areas. Therefore it is the technical areas such as athlete development, coaches development, competitions, etc., which first undergo structural development. Professional staff first appear in these technical areas - i.e., technical directors, provincial coaches. Even when professional staff are procured for administrative purposes (i.e., Executive Directors) often their responsibilities entail both administrative and technical activities. Professionalization leads to even more specialization and standardization as the professionals institute procedures and controls (planning systems, job descriptions, and so on).

Interviews with key informants indicated how they felt that "charismatic leaders" are able, in some cases, to significantly influence structural change in PSOs. Such leaders were able to substantially influence two organizations (AVA and ASA) in their movement from simple structures to more complex ones. Initially these organizations exhibited low levels of specialization and standardization coupled with centralized, unsystematic authority structures (centred around a few individuals). This state of affairs may have provided the pre-conditions in which a charismatic leader could be instrumental in affecting change. In organizations which are more structurally complex and which possess more systematic, decentralized authority structures, charismatic leaders are unlikely to arise and therefore less likely to affect significant change.

Recalling the concepts of "momentum" and organizational "tracks" which comprise part of the Greenwood and Hinings framework as outlined in chapter II, the following can be stated in relation to the results of this study. Momentum refers to the tendency of organizations to move toward structural coherence, a process which is strengthened by the prevailing system of values and beliefs. While not denying the possibility of change the concept of momentum suggests that radical paradigm reorientation will be uncommon. Greenwood and Hinings (1986) propose two ways in which to examine the possibility of organizational change: in the first instance change may involve the heightening of fit between the interpretive scheme of an organization and its structure, they refer to this as "intra-paradigmatic" change; in the second instance change may involve actual paradigm reorientation or "inter-paradigmatic" change. The PSOs examined as part of this study reflect change of the first kind, i.e., intra-paradigmatic change. The organizations were characterized by stable interpretive schemes (paradigm B orientation) which did not change significantly over the period of the study. During the initial timeslices these interpretive schemes were accompanied by structures which did not reflect a paradigm B orientation. However over time these structures altered and came to reflect a paradigm B orientation.

The results of this study suggest that all four PSOs are displaying "intra-paradigmatic change". Over the time period of the study these organizations operated within the assumptions of a paradigm B interpretive scheme. While initially each displayed varying degrees of structural consistency, over time all moved toward more complete structural consistency with a paradigm B orientation. In the terminology of Greenwood and Hinings these PSOs may be described as moving along an organizational track between "embryonic B" and "paradigm B".

Chap V Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

I Summary

The thesis developed in this study will be summarized and discussed according to the following categories:

A. Conceptual Background
B. Methodology
C. Findings
D. Recommendations

A. Conceptual Background

PSOs operate with particular structural arrangements which are given meaning and coherence by underlying interpretive schemes - sets of beliefs and values. Particular interpretive schemes coupled with associated structural arrangements constitute an organizational paradigm. Two paradigms are proposed for PSOs; paradigm A, the Kitchen table Volunteer and paradigm B, the Corporate Professional. Associated sets of values and structures are suggested as representative of each paradigm (see Chapter III - operational measures). An intermediate category representing sets of values and structures fitting neither paradigm A or B and indicative of transition between these paradigms is also proposed. This is termed a Schizoid orientation. The interaction between the values of organizational members and the structures through which they are expressed is mediated by contextual factors.

These contextual factors include those internal to the organization such as significant organizational members (charismatic leaders) and those external to the organization such as other organizations (government agencies) which have significant influence upon the PSO.

B. Methodology

PSO interpretive schemes were conceived as containing specific sets of beliefs and values. These values and beliefs were measured by examining the responses to statements of value preference based on issues of contemporary concern to the Alberta amateur sport community (see appendix C). These responses were scored according to a simple five point Likert scale. The scores determined placement on a scale which included three categories - Paradigm A orientation; Schizoid orientation; or a Paradigm B orientation.

PSO organizational structures were conceived of as consisting of three primary dimensions - Specialization, Standardization, and Centralization/decentralization. These dimensions were measured for each of a range of organizational systems which were thought to comprise the structured activities of the PSOs. A structured interview/questionnaire was administered to key informants (top administrators) and levels of all three dimensions were determined for each system utilizing a simple three point rating (1 - low, 2 - medium, 3 - high). These scores, when totalled for each organization over all five timeslices determined placement on a simple scale which again included three categories - Paradigm A, Schizoid orientation, and Paradigm B.

Contextual factors were also examined. Those that seemed to have most impact on the PSOs were significant or charismatic leaders, and influential external organizations such as government and parent national sport organizations. The impact of these factors was examined in a descriptive manner by asking general questions about the areas of Resources, Technology, and Environment. The responses to these questions were not dealt with in a systematic manner, but were evaluated on the basis of which factor was brought up consistently during the interviews.

C. Findings

A brief summary of the significant findings of this study are presented as follows:

i) During the initial timeslice all four PSOs exhibited interpretive schemes which supported a paradigm B orientation (CFSA-AS and CASA-AS) or a Schizoid orientation leaning toward paradigm B (AVA and ASA).

ii) During the initial timeslice two PSOs (CFSA-AS and CASA-AS) displayed levels of specialization and centralization/decentralization demonstrating a Schizoid orientation, and levels of standardization demonstrating a paradigm A orientation. Overall this indicates a structural orientation leaning toward a Schizoid orientation. The other two PSOs (AVA and ASA) displayed levels of specialization and standardization supporting a paradigm A orientation, and levels of centralization/decentralization supporting a Schizoid orientation. Overall this indicates a structural orientation leaning toward paradigm A.

iii) Initially (timeslice #1) three of four PSOs possessed interpretive schemes reflecting a paradigm B or near paradigm B orientation (the exception was the AVA). Accompanying these interpretive schemes were structures reflecting a paradigm A or near paradigm A orientation. Overall this could be described as a Schizoid paradigm orientation.

iv) During the middle and late timeslices (timeslices #2 - 5) all four PSOs displayed interpretive schemes which showed a strengthening paradigm B orientation.

v) During the middle and late timeslices increases in levels of specialization and standardization were shown by all four PSOs. These increases reflect a paradigm B orientation on these dimensions. During this same time all four PSOs displayed levels of centralization which were unchanged and which still reflected a Schizoid orientation.

vi) By the final timeslice all four PSOs displayed interpretive schemes and corresponding structures which more or less reflected a coherent paradigm B orientation. The CFSA-AS and CASA-AS showed interpretive schemes supporting a paradigm B orientation, levels of specialization and standardization supporting a paradigm B orientation, and levels of centralization supporting a Schizoid orientation. The AVA and ASA showed interpretive schemes supporting a near paradigm B orientation, levels of specialization and standardization supporting a paradigm B orientation, and levels of centralization supporting a Schizoid orientation.

vii) Finally, the results suggest that increases in the dimensions of specialization and standardization occur at different rates both between different systems among organizations and between different systems within an individual organization.

II Conclusions and Discussion

The results and discussion have revolved around identifying organizational paradigms, examining the differences between paradigms, and describing the movement between or within paradigms. The basis of this identification, examination, and description has been the measurement of organizational interpretive schemes (values and beliefs) and organizational structures (specialization, standardization, and centralization/decentralization). Some explanation has been given as to how the values which comprise a PSO's interpretive scheme may influence the organization's structure and the way in which it relates to its environment. Some explanation has been given as to the reciprocal effect of the environment on the structures ~~of~~ PSOs and the impact this can have on the organization's values and beliefs. This leads to the question of why PSOs follow particular paths of transition between paradigms.

An answer can be provided by understanding, as Greenwood and Hinings (1986) suggest, the combinations of situational and strategic circumstances that produce paradigm inertia and paradigm reorientation. They propose a framework for examining these circumstances which incorporates three dynamics.

The first dynamic concerns the fit between contingencies such as context and environment with organizational structures and processes. The implication is that effective task accomplishment is achieved by modifying structures and processes to fit the requirements of situational constraints. Changes to organizational structure must occur when discrepancies exist between task contingencies and the capabilities of existing structures. Absence of contradictions such as these would result in paradigm coherence. The situation of the PSOs in this study could be described as the readjustment of organizational structures to fit the changing demands of their environmental contingencies. This is not to suggest however that the structures of these PSOs are being transformed for reasons unconnected to the values and beliefs which make up their interpretive schemes.

The results of this study would suggest that it is the interpretive schemes held by the organizational actors which are driving the structural change. External agencies, primarily the NSOs and the two levels of government, are playing a major role in influencing these interpretive schemes by defining the institutional circumstances within which the PSOs can acceptably operate (the development of high performance sport) and by prescribing the organizational means by which activities can be undertaken (rational, efficient, professional administration). Compliance is maintained by control over the criteria by which financial and other material resources are allocated. This leads to the discussion of the second and third dynamics.

The second and third dynamics concern relations that were not empirically dealt with in this study but to which reference must be made in order to increase understanding of PSOs and to inform directions for future study. The second dynamic concerns the structure of power dependencies within the organization. Greenwood and Hinings (1986) suggest that organizational structures tend to serve the interests of the dominant faction. Structural change is determined by the abilities of factions to express and consolidate their interests in structural terms (Greenwood and Hinings, 1986). The dominant faction utilizes structure to obtain and use power. Although there is not consensus on all issues, the situation of the PSOs may be described as one where the dominant faction is operating unhindered in producing and utilizing organizational structures. This is not to suggest a conspiracy, but to describe a situation where only one organizational faction is capable of expressing their interests in a way which can influence structures. This situation would explain the stable interpretive schemes present in the PSOs and the steady structural movement towards a paradigm B orientation.

The third dynamic concerns the range of commitment to alternative and prevailing interpretive schemes. The situation in the PSOs under study illustrates a wide spread commitment to the prevailing interpretive scheme (paradigm B). Alternative interpretive schemes are not vocalized by organizational members either because they are not interested at this point in alternative values or because they are not organized at a level which would permit expression of alternative interpretive schemes. The situation at the NSO level would suggest it is the latter explanation. At the level of interaction between NSOs and the federal government organizational factions advocating issues such as "athletes rights" and "gender equality" are just beginning to initiate structural change (and many argue that many changes are required). Factions within some NSOs have been instrumental in the appearance of athlete agreements which serve to protect amateur athletes against undue exploitation. Examples such as this illustrate the development and consolidation of alternative interpretive schemes. These value orientations are just beginning to exert pressure on the existing structures.

III Recommendations

The most immediate suggestion for further research calls for the replication and extension of the methods and theoretical framework used in this study. The sample should be increased to include the population of PSOs in Alberta. The methods should be elaborated to include application of statistical techniques such as factor analysis. This would increase explanatory power by allowing an expansion in the number and detail of variables examined, and by extending the range of inter-variable relationships available for scrutiny. In addition to variables used to measure interpretive schemes and structural dimensions, variables capable of examining the impact of contextual factors should be added. Formulation of these variables should allow for rigorous examination of factors such as size, technology, resources, and environment. Lastly, methods should be applied to examine the structure of power dependencies within PSOs. This would require application of questionnaires and interviews to a broader spectrum of organizational members (athletes, coaches, officials, as well as administrators). Consideration of these recommendations should allow a more rigorous and complete application of the Greenwood and Hinings framework.

The results of such a replication would serve to achieve two objectives. First, such a research program will assist in the elaboration of the Greenwood and Hinings framework by putting it to further empirical test. The utility of concepts such as paradigm, momentum, tracks, interpretive schemes, etc. will also be subject to further test. Second, it will provide further insight to the nature of PSOs, their structural and ideational evolution, and the nature of the relationship with their organizational context.

The results of the present study also illustrate the need to consider another set of questions posed by Greenwood and Hinings (1986). These concern the temporal association of organizations with specific paradigms. The first concerns the possible existence of alternate tracks of organizational change, separate from those indicated by this study. Will PSOs continue to exhibit paradigm inertia, retaining the value assumptions of the prevailing interpretive and the corresponding structural arrangements? Alternately, will they break from the present organizational paradigm and deploy alternate interpretive schemes with a consequent modification of structural arrangements? If so what will be the rate and sequence of the ensuing interpretive de-coupling and re-coupling? Attempts to answer questions such as these will lead to better understanding of the nature of organizational change in general, and the nature of change within PSOs in particular.

VI Bibliography

Alberta Recreation and Parks. **Sport Development Policy.** Edmonton: Government of Alberta, Item 10, p. 9, 1983.

Argyris, C., and Schon, D. **Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective.** Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1977.

Babchuk, N., and Booth, A. "Voluntary Association Membership: A Longitudinal Analysis." **American Sociological Review**, 1969, 34, 31-45.

Baka, R. S. "A History of Provincial Government Involvement in Sport in Western Canada." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, The University of Alberta, 1978.

Beamish, R. "Sport Executives and Voluntary Associations: A Review of the Literature and Commentary upon some theoretical Issues." Paper presented at the **C.A.P.H.E.R. Conference**, Toronto, 1983.

Beamish, R. "Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics of the National Executive of Selected Amateur Sports in Canada (1975)." **Working Papers in the Sociological Study of Sports and Leisure**, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1978.

Booth, A., Babchuk, N., and Knox, A. "Social Stratification and Membership in Instrumental-Expressive Voluntary Associations." **Sociological Quarterly**, 1968, 9, 427-439.

Booth, A. Sex and Social Participation. **American Sociological Review**, 1972, 37, 183-192.

Bratton, R. D. "Consensus on the Relative Importance of Association Goals and Personal Motives Among Executive Members of Two Canadian Sport Associations." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. The University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, 1970.

Broom, E. "The Role of Canadian Provincial Governments in Sport." Unpublished Paper. The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., 1984.

Burns, T. and Stalker, G.M. **The Management of Innovation.** London: Tavistock, 1961.

Campagnolo, I. "Partners in the Pursuit of Excellence: A National Policy on Amateur Sport." Ottawa: Government of Canada, 1979.

Chandler, A. **Strategy and Structure**. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1962.

Child, J. "Organizational Structure, Environment, and Performance - The Role of Strategic Choice." **Sociology**, 1972, 6, 1-22.

Channon, D. **Strategy and Structure in British Enterprise.** Boston: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Clark, B. "The Organizational Saga in Higher Education." **Administrative Science Quarterly,** 1972, 17, 178-184.

Clegg, S. and Dunkerley, D. **Organization, Class and Control.** London: Routledge and Kegan, 1982.

Cunningham, D. "The Relationship between Structure and Values in Two Recreation Organizations." Unpublished Paper, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1984.

Curtis, J. "Voluntary Association Joining: A Cross-National Comparative Note." **American Sociological Review**, 1971, 36, 872-880.

Curtis, R. F. "Occupational Mobility and Membership in Formal Voluntary Associations: A Note on Research." **American Sociological Review**, 1959, 24, 846-848.

Cyert, R., and March, J.G. **A Behavioral Theory of the Firm**. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Daft, R.L. **Organizational Theory and Design**. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1983.

Fitness and Amateur Sport. "Quadrennial Planning Program." Ottawa: Government of Canada, 1984.

Foskett, J. M. "Social Structure and Social Participation." **American Sociological Review**, 1955, 20, 431-438.

Franks, C.E.S. and Macintosh, D. "Government and Sport Transformation in Canada." Paper presented at the **North American Society for the Sociology of Sport Conference**, Toronto, 1983.

Freeman, H. E., Novak, E., and Reeder, L.G. "Correlates of Membership in Voluntary Associations." **American Sociological Review**, 1957, 22, 528-533.

Frisby, W. "Weber's Theory of Bureaucracy and the Study of Voluntary Sport Organizations." In A. Dunleavy, A. Miricale and R. Rees (eds.) **Studies in the Sociology of Sport**. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 53-71, 1982.

Frisby, W. "The Organizational Structure and Effectiveness of Canadian National Sport Governing Bodies." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Waterloo, Ontario, 1983.

Giddens, A. **The Class Structure of Advanced Societies.** London: Hutchinson, 1973.

Giddens, A. **New Rules of Sociological Method.** New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Giddens, A. **Studies in Social and Political Theory**. New York: Basic Books, 1977

Giddens, A. **Central Problems in Social Theory**. London: MacMillan, 1979.

Greenwood, R. and Hinings, C.R. "Organizational Paradigms, Tracks and the Dynamics of Change." Unpublished paper, University of Alberta, 1984.

Greenwood, R. and Hinings, C.R. "Organizational Design Types, Tracks and the Dynamics of Change." Unpublished paper, University of Alberta, 1986.

Gordon, W. C., and Babchuk, N. "A Typology of Voluntary Associations." **American Sociological Review**, 1959, 24, 22-29.

Hagedorn, R., and Labovitz, S. "An Analysis of Community and Professional Participation Among Occupations." **Social Forces**, 1967, 46, 483-491.

Hall, R.H. "Professionalization and Bureaucratization." **American Sociological Review**, 1968, 33, 92-104.

Hall, R.H. **Organizations: Structure and Process**. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1982.

Hausknecht, M. **The Joiners: A Sociological Description of Voluntary Association Membership in the U.S**. New York: The Bedminsister Press, 1962.

Hedberg, B. "How Organizations Learn and Unlearn. in P.C. Nystrom and W.H. Starbuck (eds.)." **Handbook of Organizational Design**, Vol. I, New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Hinings, C.R. and Greenwood, R. "The Normative Prescription of Organizations." Unpublished paper, University of Alberta, 1986.

Hodge, R., W. and Freeman, D.J. "Social Participation and Social Status." **American Sociological Review**, 1968, 33, 722-740.

Hollands, R. G., and Gruneau, R.S. "Social Class and Voluntary Action in the Administration of Canadian Amateur Sport." **Working Papers in the Sociological Study of Sports and Leisure**. Vol. 2, No. 3, 1979.

Hyman, H. H., and Wright, C.R. "Trends in Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Replication Based on Secondary Analysis of National Sample Surveys." **American Sociological Review**, 1971, 36, 191-206.

Jacoby, A. "Some Correlates of Instrumental and Expressive Orientations to Associational Memberships." **Sociological Inquiry**, 1965, 35, 163-175.

Khandwalla, P. "Environment and its Impact on the Organization." **International Studies of Management and Organization**, 1972, 2, 297-313.

Khandwalla, P. "Viable and Effective Organizational Designs of Firms." **Academy of Management of Journal**, 1973, 16, 481-495.

Kidd, B. "The Canadian State and Sport; The Dilemma of Intervention."

Paper presented at **The Second Annual Conference of the National Association for Physical Education for Higher Education**. Brainerd, Minnesota, 1980.

Kimberly, J. R., and Quinn, R. E. **Managing Organizational Transitions**. Homewood Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1984.

Labovitz, S., and Hagedorn, R. **Introduction to Social Research**. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Lawrence, P.R., and Lorch, J.W. **Organization and Environment**. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin, 1967.

Lukes, S. **Essays in Social Theory**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.

Macintosh, D. and Franks, C.E.S. "Evolution of Federal Government Sport Policy in Canada, 1961-1968." A Paper Presented at the **World Congress of Sociology**, Mexico City, 1982.

Macintosh, D., Franks, C.E.S. and Bedecki, T. "Canadian Government Involvement in Sport: Some Consequences and Issues." In G. Redmond (ed.), **Sport and Politics**. Champaign, Illinois: Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc. 21-26, 1986.

Meisel, J., and Lemieux, V. "Ethnic Studies in Canadian Voluntary Associations." Ottawa: Information Canada, 1972.

Meyer, J.W., and Rowan, B. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." **American Journal of Sociology**, 1977, 83, 340-363.

Michels, R. **Political Parties**. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949

Miles, R.E., and Snow C.C. **Organizational Strategy, Structure and Process**. New York: McGraw Hill, 1978.

Miller, D. and Friesen P. "Archetypes of Strategy Formulation." **Management Science**, 1978, 24, 921-933.

Miller, D., and Friesen, P.H. "Momentum and Revolution in Organizational Adaptation." **Academy of Management Journal**, 1980a, 23, 591-694.

Miller, D. and Friesen, P.H. "Archetypes of Organizational Transition." **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 1980b, 5, 268-299.

Miller, D. and Friesen, P.H. **Organizations A Quantum View**. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1984.

Mintzberg, H. "Strategy Making in Three Modes." **California Management Review**, 1973, 16, 44-58.

Mintzberg, H. **The Structuring of Organizations**. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1979.

Mitroff, I., and Kilmann, R. "On Organizational Stories." In R. Kilmann, L. Pondy, and D. Slevin (eds.), **The Management of Organization Design: Vol. 1, Strategies and Implementation.** New York: American Elsevier, 1976, 189-208.

Negandhi, A.R., and Reimann, B. "A Contingency Theory of Organization Re-examined in the Context of a Developing Country." **Academy of Management Journal**, 1972, 15, 137-146.

Nicholls, Ernest. "An Analysis of the Structure and Function of Three Provincial Sports Collectives in Western Canada." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1982.

Paine, F., and Anderson, C. "Contingencies Affecting Strategy Formulation and Effectiveness." **Journal of Management Studies**, 1977, 14, 147-158.

Parkhouse, B. and Ulrich, D. "Sport Management as a Potential Cross-Discipline: A Paradigm for Theoretical Application." **Quest**, 1979, 31, 264-276.

Pettigrew, A. **The Politics of Organizational Decision Making**. London: Tavistock, 1973.

Pettigrew, A. "Internal Politics and the Emergence and Decline of Departmental Groups." Working Paper, London Graduate School of Business, 1974.

Pfeffer, J. **Organizational Design**. Arlington Heights, Ill.: HHM Publishing, 1978.

Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G.R. **The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective**. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Pitter, R., Slack, T., and Cunningham, D. "A Theoretical and Methodological Framework for the Study of Paradigmatic Change in Voluntary Sport Organizations." Paper presented at **The 1985 CAPHER Conference**, London, Ontario, 1985.

Pugh, D. S., Hickson, D.J., Hinings, C.R., Macdonald, K.M., Turner, C. and Lupton, T. "A Conceptual Scheme for Organizational Analysis." **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 1963, 8, 289-315.

Pugh, D.S., Hickson, D.J., Hinings, C. R. and Turner, C. "Dimensions of Organizational Structure." **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 1968, 13, 65-105.

Pugh, D.S., Hickson, D.J., Hinings, C.R., and Turner, C. "The Context of Organization Structures." **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 1969, 14, 91-112.

Quinn, R. E., and Anderson, D.F. "Formalization as Crisis: Transition Planning for a Young Organization" in Kimberly, J.R., and Quinn, R.E. **Managing Organizational Transitions**. Homewood Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1984.

Ranson, S., Hinings, C.R., and Greenwood, R. "The Structuring of Organizational Structures." **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 1980, 25, 1-17.

Raphael, E. "The Anderson-Warton Hypothesis in Local Unions: A Comparative Study." **American Sociological Review**, 1967, 32, 768-776.

Rumelt, R. **Strategy, Structure and Economic Performance**. Boston, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Schon, Donald. **Beyond the Stable Gate**. London: Temple Smith, 1971.

Selznick, P. TVA and the Grass Roots: **A Study in the Sociology of Formal Organization**. Berkeley: University of California Press,

1949

Simpson, R. L., and Gulley, W.H. "Goals, Environmental Pressures and Organizational Characteristics." **American Sociological Review**, 1967, 27, 344-350.

Slack, T. "Selected Characteristics of Volunteer Sport Administrators." Unpublished Master's Thesis. The University of Alberta, 1979.

Slack, T. "An Organizational Case Analysis of a Volunteer Sport Organization." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. University of Alberta, 1983.

Slack, T. "The Bureaucratization of a Voluntary Sport Organization." **International Review for the Sociology of Sport**, 1985, 20, 145-165.

Slack, T. and Hinings, C.R. "Planning and Organization: A Conceptual Framework for the Analysis of Amateur Sport Organizations." Unpublished Paper, University of Alberta, 1986.

Starbuck, W.H. "Organizations as Action Generators." **American Sociological Review**, 1983, 48, 91-102.

Theberge, N.A. "A Comparison of Men and Women in Leadership Roles in Ontario Amateur Sport." A Report Submitted to the Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation, 1980.

Thompson, J. **Organizations in Action**. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Walsh, K., Hinings, C.R., Greenwood, R., and Ranson, S. "Power and Advantage in Organizations." **Organizational Studies**, 1981, 2, 131-152.

Warriner, C., and Prather, J. "Four Types of Voluntary Associations." **Sociological Inquiry**, 1965, 35, 138-148.

Watson, G. "Resistance to Change." In W. Bennis, K. Benne, and R. Chin (eds.), **The Planning of Change**. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969

Weber, Max. **On Charisma and Institution Building**. S.N. Eisenstadt (ed)

Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1968.

Weick, K.E. **The Social Psychology of Organizing**. (2nd Edition). Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1979.

Wildavsky, A. "The Self Evaluating Organization." **Public Administration Review**, 1972, 32, 509-520.

Wilensky, H. **Organizational Intelligence**. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Woodward, J. **Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Zucker, L.G. "The Role of Institutionalization in Cultural Persistence." **American Sociological Review**, 1977, 2, 726-743.

Appendix A

Structure Questionnaire

Structure Questions

A. Communication

We would like to know something about the various meetings and committees that your organization has. Could you please answer the following questions:

1. Which of the following types of meetings does your organization hold:
    a. An Annual General Meeting.
    b. A Semi Annual or any other type of General Meeting.
    c. Board of Directors meetings, how often are these held.
    d. Executive Committee meetings, how often are these held.
2. For any of the above, does your organization have guidelines (written or otherwise) which determine how the meetings have to be conducted and how often they have to be held.
3. What type of decisions are made at these meetings and what percentage of organizational decisions, would you estimate, are finalized at this level.
4. What other committees does your organization have, could you tell me briefly what they do.
5. Do any of these committees have written guidelines/terms of reference about how they operate and what areas they are to cover.
6. What type of decisions are made by these committees and what percentage of organizational decisions, would you estimate, are finalized at this level.
7. Do some people serve on more than one committee, if so to what extent do these committees overlap.
8. Does your organization have a newsletter, magazine or some other publication. If so, how often is it published. How is this publication produced.
9. What other methods do the various components of your organization, board, committees, membership, etc. use to communicate to each other. (For example, how does the board send information to members, how do members have input into board and committee

decisions.)

10. What methods (e.g. newsletters, reports, press releases) do the various components of your organization use to communicate to other organizations (e.g. provincial government, Sports Council, national body, etc.).

B. Management Information System

1. Could you briefly describe to me how the senior managers (either volunteer or professional) exchange information, also could you tell me how these people ensure that the day to day operation of the organization is carried out e.g. are paid staff members or volunteers required to submit work plans, daily, weekly or monthly reports, etc.
2. Is the method for the monitoring of the organization's day to day operations formally laid down or does this happen on a more ad hoc basis.
3. Who is responsible for ensuring the monitoring of the organization's day to day operations.

C. Scanning

1. Does your organization have any type of procedures for finding out what is happening in other organizations e.g., the provincial government, the Sports Council, the national body, etc. that may have an impact on your particular group.

D. Planning

1. As part of the requirements for the provincial government your organization is required to submit a three year plan. To the best of your knowledge did your organization develop goals and/or objectives in any of the following areas, if so could you tell me a little about what was developed:
   a. Technical programs, e.g. Junior Development, Sport Outreach, coaching clinics, etc.
   b. Organizational structure and processes, e.g. the creation of zones, regions, other committees, etc., the establishment of job descriptions, policy guidelines and so on.

   c. Communication/Information Systems, e.g. the publishing of a newsletter, the establishment of regular meetings, etc.
   d. Control Systems, e.g. the planning and/or evaluation of programs, the training of members for various roles.
   e. Marketing/Promotion Systems e.g. a public relations campaign or a particular technique to market your sport.

2. If you have plans in any of the above areas could you tell me how these were developed and who was involved in their development and approval.
3. Does your organization have any type of plan for developing the following types of people:
   a. Coaches
   b. Officials
   c. Administrators
4. Again, could you tell me who would be involved in developing and approving these plans.

E. Training

1. Does your organization provide any type of training opportunities for the following types of members:
   a. Administrators
   b. Athletes
   c. Coaches
   d. Officials
2. If so, are these training procedures written down and formally agreed upon by the organization.
3. Could you also tell me who decides on the training material to be included.

F. Decision-Making

Apart from the areas we have already mentioned:

1. Could you briefly tell me about how decisions about different areas are made in your organization, e.g. Junior Development.

2. Is there any type of set procedure for the making of certain decisions.
3. Which individuals or organizational sub-units do you see as being the key decision-makers in your organizations.

G. Evaluation

1. Does your organization evaluate the following types of individuals or organizational sub-groups:
    - a. Paid staff.
    - b. Coaches (paid or volunteer).
    - c. Officials.
    - d. Volunteer Administrators.
    - e. Athletes.
    - f. Committees.
2. Are the methods for evaluation formally laid down.
3. Who is responsible for undertaking these evaluations and how often do they take place.

H. Human Resource Development

1. In the area of athlete development could you please tell me if your organization undertakes any of the following tasks and if so to what extent are the procedures for the tasks formally written down and universally accepted and followed by members of the organization:
    - a. Identifying talented athletes.
    - b. Ensuring athletes are able to progress through the various competitive levels of the sport.
    - c. Physiologically and psychologically testing athletes.
    - d. Running training programs for individual athletes or teams.
    - e. Selecting competitions for athletes or teams.
    - f. Selecting athletes to compete on provincial teams.
    - g. Funding provincial team athletes.
2. Could you also tell me, for each of the preceding areas, who is responsible for

making decisions about these areas.

3. In the area of coaches development could you please tell me if your organization undertakes any of the following tasks and if so to what extent are the procedures for the tasks formally written down and universally accepted and followed by members of the organization:
   a. Identifying potentially talented coaches.
   b. Ensuring selected coaches are given the opportunity to progress through the various coaching levels of the sport.
   c. Practical and/or written testing of coaches.
   d. Training programs for coaches.
   e. Selecting coaches to work with specific teams.
   f. Funding coaches.
4. Could you also tell me, for each of the preceding areas who is responsible for making decisions about these areas.
5. In the area of officials' development could you please tell me if your organization undertakes any of the following tasks and if so to what extent are the procedures for the tasks formally written down and universally accepted and followed by members of the organization:
   a. Identifying potential officials (both major and minor officials).
   b. Ensuring selected officials are able to progress through the various competitive levels of the sport.
   c. Practical and/or written testing of officials.
   d. Training officials.
   e. Selecting officials to work specific events.
   f. Funding officials.
6. Could you also tell me, for each of the preceding areas who is responsible for making decisions about these areas.
7. In the area of administration could you please tell me if your organization undertakes any of the following tasks and if so to what extent are the procedures for the tasks formally written down and universally accepted and followed by members of the organization:

a. The organization and operation of sporting events.

b. The organization and operation of related events e.g. clinics, seminars, workshops, etc.

c. The training of administrators.

d. The raising of funds.

8. Could you also tell me, for each of the preceding areas who is responsible for making decisions about these areas.

I. Marketing/Promotion

1. Could you briefly tell me how your organization markets/promotes your particular sport to the general public, the media, etc.
2. Are there any formally laid out procedures for the marketing/promoting aspects of the sport.
3. Who would be responsible for making decisions about this area.

J. Finance

1. Could you briefly describe to me the type of budgeting and accounting procedures (financial accountability) that your organization uses.
2. Are these procedures formally laid down and documented.
3. Who makes the decisions regarding the financial procedures of your organization.

K. Research and Development

1. Could you tell me if your organization is involved in any type of research related to any aspect of your sport.
2. Are there any formalized regulations/procedures regarding research undertakings.
3. Who makes the decisions regarding the research program of your organization.

General Information Questions

L. Resources

1. Physical, - Which of the following physical resources does your organizaiton own or have direct access to:
    - a. an office
    - b. a training center
    - c. a permanent competitions site
    - d. any form of vehicle
    - e. a computer
    - f. a word processor
    - g. video equipment
    - h. any other tehcnical resources e.g. manuals, films, etc.
2. Human Resources/Role Specialization - Which of the following types of individuals does your organization employ on a regular continuing basis , either full- or part-time.
    - a. Provincial Coach - Men
    - b. Provincial Coach - Women
    - c. Assistant Provincial Coach(es) - Men
    - d. Assistant Provincial Coach(es) - Women
    - e. Executive Director
    - f. Technical Director
    - g. Program Coordinator
    - h. Secretary
    - i. Accountant
    - j. Athletic Trainer/Therapist
    - k. Medical Doctor
    - l. Physiotherapist
    - m. Psychologist
    - n. Physiologist
    - o. Bio-mechanist
    - p. Researcher
    - q. Other

3. Human Resources/Role Specialization - Which of the following Volunteer Roles (or their equivilant) do individuals fill in your organization.
   - a. President/Chair
   - b. Past President/Chair
   - c. V.P. Provincial Teams
   - d. V.P. Finance/Treasurer
   - e. V.P. Marketing/Public Relations
   - f. V.P. Recreational Development
   - g. V.P. Technical Programs
   - h. V.P. Geographical
   - i. V.P. Coaching
   - j. V.P. Officials
   - k. V.P. Disabled Athletes
   - l. Team Manager
   - m. Secretary
   - n. Zone Coordinator
   - o. Athletes Representative
   - p. Other
4. Financial.
   - a. Could you tell me the approximate size of your budget and give me a rough breakdown as to where your funds are obtained from.

M. Technology

1.

Could you give me some idea of how technically sophisticated your sport has become e.g., do you use game films, physiological tests, etc.

2. Could you give me some idea of how sophisticated you feel the training techniques and equipment associated with your sport have become.
3. Could you give me some idea of how technically sophisticated you feel the administration of your sport has become, e.g., do you make use of resources such as computer, financial accounting systems, conference calls, etc.

N. Organizational Characteristics

1. How many people are there in your organization.
2. How many paid staff (either full-or part-time) do you employ.
3. Do you know how long your organization has been in existence.
4. How long is the term of office for your board members.
5. How long do members actually stay on the board.

O. Environment

1. To operate effectively organizations require resources such as money, information, people, the ability to regulate activities, and so on. Could you tell me what in your opinion, are the major resources that your organization needs if it is to be successful. Could you also tell me why your organization needs these resources.
2. Could you please tell me, in order of importance if possible, which organizations provide your group with the resources that you have identified above.
3. During your involvement with (sport) can you identify any specific societal influences (e.g. an economic downturn, a change in government etc.) that have affected the way your organization operated and developed.
4. Also, during your involvement with (sport) can you identify any particular values and beliefs (e.g. a belief in the necessity for professional staff, values that saw the importance of high level sport etc.) that have affected the way your organization operated and developed.

Appendix B

Value Areas

MAJOR VALUE AREAS

1. There has been a change in the values and beliefs that people hold about the program focus of amateur sport organizations.

2. There has been a change in the values and beliefs that individuals hold about the involvement of government agencies in amateur sport.

3. There has been a change in the values and beliefs that individuals hold about the staff requirements of amateur sport organizations.

4. There has been a change in the values and beliefs that individuals hold about the complexity and sophistication of the organizational processes that are necessary to run a provincial sport organization.

5. There has been a change in the values and beliefs of the administrators, coaches, officials and participants of provincial sport organizations.

6. There has been a change in the values and beliefs about the application of scientific principles to all aspects of amateur sport.

7. There has been a change in the values and beliefs concerning the provision of sports programs for groups which did not previously have a complete range of opportunities in sport.

7

Appendix C

Value Questionnaire

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The formulation of procedures such as staff contracts, operating procedures, program guidelines, etc. should not be an administrative priority within our organization.	___	___	___	___	___
2. The primary function of our member organizations should be to produce high performance (provincial, national and international level) athletes.	___	___	___	___	___
3. We feel that volunteers acting by themselves are no longer sufficient to handle the operation of our organization.	___	___	___	___	___
4. Frequent and regularly scheduled meetings (e.g. board, executive, committee, etc.) are not important to the operation of our organization.	___	___	___	___	___

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5. Our organization should be committed to the use of technology to assist us in both technical and administrative functions.	___	___	___	___	___
6. Our member organizations believe that it is important for them to make use of formally laid down policies and procedures.	___	___	___	___	___
7. Our organization believes that the provincial government should not become involved in the planning and development of our programs.	___	___	___	___	___
8. A large amount of our member organizations professional and volunteer staff time should be concerned with the administration and development of elite/high performance programs.	___	___	___	___	___
9. Our member organizations feel that less emphasis should be placed on the application of scientific methods in the development of athletes.	___	___	___	___	___

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
10. Our organization does not believe that the provincial government's involvement in sport should be ongoing and direct.	___	___	___	___	___
11. Our member organizations are committed to providing an equal number of programs for athletes of each sex.	___	___	___	___	___
12. Attempting to provide equal opportunities for groups that currently do not have this privilege takes away from the real purpose of our organization.	___	___	___	___	___
13. Our member organizations believe that it is just as important to provide opportunities for all athletes regardless of sex, age, or disability, as it is to provide opportunities for elite athletes.	___	___	___	___	___
14. We believe that the hiring of professional staff is essential if we are to greatly improve the operation and programs of our organization.	___	___	___	___	___

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15. Our members believe that the emergence of direct government involvement in a growing number of areas related to our sport organization has greatly helped its development.	___	___	___	___	___
16. Our members believe that the direct involvement of the provincial government in their sport organizations is not beneficial to their development.	___	___	___	___	___
17. We believe that the majority of people who participate in our member organization's programs do so for the recreational aspects of the sport not for the desire to become high level performers.	___	___	___	___	___
18. Our organization should be committed to the use of technological devices such as computers, video machines, word processors, etc.	___	___	___	___	___
19. Our members believe that the employment of paid professional staff has greatly aided the development of our organization.	___	___	___	___	___

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20. In order for us to maximize our effectiveness our organization's structure and processes should be ad hoc and informal rather than structured and formalized.	___	___	___	___	___
21. We do not feel that professional staff are able to assist our organization's development anymore than a dedicated group of volunteers.	___	___	___	___	___
22. The use of the scientific principles of training and technological aids such as computers and video equipment has little relevance for our member organizations.	___	___	___	___	___
23. Ensuring the development of elite level athletes should not be one of the major financial responsibilites of our member organizations.	___	___	___	___	___
24. Our member organizations readily support activities such as the senior's games and the disabled games.	___	___	___	___	___

BLANK PAGE INSERTED

BLANK PAGE INSERTED

Appendix D

Decision Events

Decision Events

1. Replacement of paid personnel i.e. Executive Director
2. The significant expansion of programs or a major change in the delivery of an important existing program.
3. Adoption of a new technology i.e. new coaching techniques, introduction of advanced equipment or facilities.
4. Significant change in the external environment i.e. changes in government policy, sizeable increases or reductions in available resources, etc.
5. Significant changes in the administrative practices i.e. changes in control systems, information systems, planning methods, etc.
6. Significant modification in organizational structure i.e. addition of major new sub-units, redistribution of authority, etc.
7. Hosting of major national/international competitions.

Table #1: Timeslices

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
AVA	1969*	1974 (2,3,4,5,6)	1978 (1,2,5,6)	1981 (1,2,5,6)	1984-86* (1,2,4,6)**
ASA	1969	1975 (2,4,5,6)	1978 (1,2,5,6)	1982 (1,2,5,6)	1985-86 (1,6)
CFSA-AS	1969	1973 (2,4,5)	1977 (1,5,6)	1980 (1,2,4,5,6)	1984-86 (1,2,4,5,6)
CASA-AS	1969	1973 (2,4,5)	1977 (2,5,6)	1981 (1,2,5)	1984-86 (2,4,6)

* 1969: Beginning of period of analysis for all organizations
1986: End of period of analysis for all organizations

** Number of Decision Event on the basis of which timeslice determined

Appendix E

Results:
Value Questionnaire Results - Table #2
Structure Questionnaire Results - Tables #3(a-d)

Table #2: Value Questionnaire Scores

AVA	Timeslice				
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
Elite/Recr	9/20	10/20	10/20	7/20	13/20
Prof/Vol	15/20	16/20	20/20	15/20	16/20
Stand/Form	7/20	8/20	20/20	16/20	12/20
Scien/Princp	9/20	10/20	20/20	18/20	17/20
Total	40/80	44/80	70/80	56/80	58/80

ASA	Timeslice				
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
Elite/Recr	6/20	14/20	5/20	12/20	8/20
Prof/Vol	14/20	19/20	17/20	16/20	16/20
Stand/Form	15/20	11/20	17/20	16/20	17/20
Scien/Princp	15/20	14/20	17/20	14/20	15/20
Total	50/80	58/80	56/80	58/80	56/80

CFSA-AS	Timeslice				
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
Elite/Recr	18/20	18/20	13/20	11/20	10/20
Prof/Vol	18/20	18/20	17/20	18/20	16/20
Stand/Form	17/20	19/20	17/20	17/20	19/20
Scien/Princp	13/20	14/20	15/20	16/20	17/20
Total	66/80	69/80	62/80	62/80	62/80

CASA-AS	Timeslice				
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
Elite/Recr	18/20	14/20	16/20	17/20	14/20
Prof/Vol	17/20	18/20	16/20	17/20	17/20
Stand/Form	18/20	19/20	15/20	15/20	16/20
Scien/Princip	12/20	19/20	19/20	19/20	14/20
Total	65/80	70/80	66/80	68/80	61/80

Table #3a: Structure Questionnaire Scores
ASA

Timeslice

Specializtn	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
A. Commun.	6/15	8/15	10/15	11/15	12/15
C. Scanning	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3
D. Planning	2/6	2/6	5/6	5/6	5/6
E. Training	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
F. Dec. makng	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	3/3
G. Evaluation	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
H. Hum. Res. Dv.	4/12	6/12	8/12	10/12	10/12
I. Mark/Promo.	1/3	1/3	2/3	3/3	3/3
J. Finance	1/3	1/3	2/3	3/3	3/3
K. Research/Dv.	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3
L. Resources	3/6	4/6	4/6	6/6	6/6
Total	22/60	27/60	39/60	49/60	50/60
Standztn					
A. Commun.	3/9	4/9	7/9	8/9	8/9
B. Mgmt. Inf. Sys.	2/6	2/6	4/6	4/6	5/6
E. Training	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3
F. Dec. Makng	1/3	1/3	2/3	1/3	2/3
G. Evaluation	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3
H. Hum. Res. Dv.	4/12	5/12	9/12	8/12	11/12
I. Mark/Promo.	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3
J. Finance	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	3/3
K. Research/Dv.	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3
Total	15/45	17/45	28/45	30/45	36/45
Centralztn					
A. Commun.	6/6	5/6	4/6	4/6	4/6
B. Mgmt. Inf. Sys.	3/3	3/3	2/3	1/3	2/3
D. Planning	3/6	5/6	4/6	4/6	4/6
E. Training	1/3	2/3	2/3	1/3	1/3
F. Dec. Makng	3/3	3/3	2/3	1/3	1/3
G. Evaluation	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3
H. Hum. Res. Dv.	10/12	8/12	8/12	6/12	7/12
I. Mark/Promo.	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
J. Finance	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
K. Research/Dv.	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3	3/3
Total	35/45	36/45	29/45	25/45	28/45

Table #3b: Structure Questionnaire Scores

CASA-AS

			Timeslice		
Specialztn	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
A. Commun.	12/15	12/15	13/15	13/15	13/15
C. Scanning	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3
D. Planning	3/6	5/6	6/6	5/6	6/6
E. Training	1/3	2/3	3/3	3/3	3/3
F. Dec. Makng.	2/3	3/3	3/3	3/3	3/3
G. Evaluation	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3
H. Hum. Res. Dv.	7/12	9/12	10/12	10/12	10/12
I. Mark/Promo.	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
J. Finance	1/3	1/3	3/3	3/3	3/3
K. Research/Dv.	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3
L. Resources	5/6	5/6	6/6	6/6	6/6
Total	35/60	41/60	48/60	48/60	52/60
Standztn					
A. Commun.	6/9	7/9	9/9	9/9	9/9
B. Mgmt. Inf. Sys.	2/6	2/6	4/6	4/6	5/6
E. Training	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	3/3
F. Dec. Makng.	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
G. Evaluation	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	3/3
H. Hum. Res. Dv.	7/12	8/12	10/12	10/12	10/12
I. Mark/Promo.	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
J. Finance	1/3	2/3	3/3	3/3	3/3
K. Research/Dv.	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3
Total	21/45	26/45	35/45	35/45	39/45
Centralztn					
A. Commun.	5/6	6/6	5/6	5/6	5/6
B. Mgmt. Inf. Sys.	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
D. Planning	4/6	5/6	3/6	5/6	4/6
E. Training	3/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
F. Dec. Makng.	2/3	3/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
G. Evaluation	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
H. Hum. Res. Dv.	5/12	9/12	9/12	7/12	6/12
I. Mark/Promo	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3
J. Finance	2/3	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3
K. Research/Dv.	3/3	3/3	3/3	1/3	1/3
Total	28/45	35/45	32/45	30/45	28/45

Table #3c: Structure Questionnaire Scores
CFSA-AS

	Timeslice				
Specialztn	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
A. Commun.	11/15	13/15	12/15	13/15	14/15
C. Scanning	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3
D. Planning	3/6	3/6	5/6	5/6	6/6
E. Training	2/3	2/3	3/3	3/3	3/3
F. Dec. Makng.	2/3	2/3	1/3	1/3	1/3
G. Evaluation	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
H. Hum. Res. Dv.	7/12	8/12	9/12	9/12	10/12
I. Mark/Promo.	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
J. Finance	1/3	1/3	2/3	3/3	3/3
K. Research/Dv.	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3
L. Resources	4/6	4/6	5/6	5/6	6/6
Total	34/60	38/60	43/60	45/60	51/60
Standztn					
A. Commun.	4/9	4/9	7/9	8/9	8/9
B. Mgmt. Inf. Sys.	2/6	2/6	3/6	4/6	4/6
E. Training	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3
F. Dec. Makng.	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3
G. Evaluation	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
H. Hum. Res. Dv.	5/12	7/12	7/12	8/12	10/12
I. Mark/Promo.	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3
J. Finance	1/3	1/3	2/3	3/3	3/3
K. Research/Dv.	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3
Total	17/45	19/45	25/45	30/45	33/45
Centralztn					
A. Commun.	3/6	4/6	4/6	4/6	4/6
B. Mgmt. Inf. Sys.	3/3	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3
D. Planning	4/6	4/6	6/6	4/6	4/6
E. Training	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	1/3
F. Dec. Makng.	3/3	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3
G. Evaluation	3/3	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3
H. Hum. Res. Dv.	7/12	7/12	9/12	6/12	6/12
I. Mark/Promo.	3/3	2/3	1/3	2/3	1/3
J. Finance	3/3	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3
K. Research/Dv.	3/3	3/3	3/3	3/3	3/3
Total	34/45	33/45	34/45	29/45	27/45

Table #3d: Structure Questionnaire Scores

AVA

		Timeslice			
Specialztn	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
A. Commun.	6/15	7/15	11/15	13/15	13/15
C. Scanning	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
D. Planning	3/6	4/6	5/6	5/6	6/6
E. Training	2/3	2/3	2/3	3/3	3/3
F. Dec. Makng.	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
G. Evaluation	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
H. Hum. Res.	7/12	7/12	9/12	11/12	11/12
I. Mark/Promo.	1/3	1/3	2/3	1/3	2/3
J. Finance	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	3/3
K. Research/Dv.	3/6	3/6	5/6	5/6	6/6
Total	29/60	31/60	43/60	47/60	52/60
Standztn					
A. Commun.	3/9	4/9	5/9	8/9	8/9
B. Mgmt. Inf. Sys.	2/6	2/6	4/6	4/6	5/6
E. Training	1/3	1/3	3/3	2/3	2/3
F. Dec. Makng.	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
G. Evaluation	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
H. Hum. Res. Dv.	6/12	5/12	8/12	8/12	10/12
I. Mark/Promo.	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3
J. Finance	1/3	1/3	2/3	2/3	3/3
K. Research/Dv.	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3
Total	17/45	17/45	28/45	30/45	35/45
Centralztn					
A. Commun.	3/6	4/6	5/6	5/6	5/6
B. Mgmt. Inf. Sys.	3/3	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3
D. Planning	3/6	3/6	4/6	4/6	4/6
E. Training	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3
F. Dec. Makng.	2/3	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3
G. Evaluation	1/3	1/3	2/3	1/3	2/3
H. Hum. Res. Dv.	7/12	7/12	8/12	7/12	8/12
I. Mark/Promo.	3/3	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3
J. Finance	3/3	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3
K. Research/Dv.	3/3	3/3	3/3	3/3	1/3
Total	29/45	31/45	35/45	29/45	30/45